THE DIRECTOR OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

HARRY C. MUNRO

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary

BV 1531 .M86 1930 26832 M926

The Director of Religious Education

By

HARRY C. MUNRO

With an Introduction by

LUTHER A. WEIGLE

Dean of the Divinity School,
Yale University

a41
127

PHILADELPHIA
THE WESTMINSTER PRESS
1930

Copyright, 1930, by
Oscar M. Miller



PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

This book is dedicated to

BERTHA E. MUNRO

whose chief delight it is to practice
the principles herein set forth.

INTRODUCTION

We are sharing in a revival of the teaching function of the Christian Church. There is a general awakening to the danger of intrusting the education of children to public schools from which religion has been eliminated and relying upon educationally incompetent Sunday Schools to make up the deficiency. We are coming to see that, not only for children but for adults, the whole of the life and work of the Church may and should be conceived in educational terms.

The work of religious education has thus outgrown lay leadership. It has not outgrown lay participation or lay responsibility, and should not. But its leadership demands the full time and thought of men and women specially trained, as competent in this field as we expect teachers, supervisors, and administrators in public schools and colleges to be competent in their fields.

The past two decades have been a period of experimentation and growth. In spite of the Great War, the controversy over prohibition, the prevalence of jazz, and the extravagant behavior of those who brook no restraint and care for no standards, the Christian Churches have been making substantial progress; and this progress has been especially marked with respect to religious education.

It is the merit of this book to set forth the results of this experimentation and progress in its exposition of the function and duties of the director of religious education. Its author has been close to the movement which he describes, through service in a local church, on the religious-educational staff of one of the larger denominations, and on the staff of the International Council of Religious Education.

Three principles underlie the author's discussion of the various phases of the work of the director of religious education, which seem to me to be so soundly conceived as to touch bed rock. The first of these is that the Church as such must conceive all that it is and does as in part an educational enterprise. The primary interest and ultimate concern of the Church is with persons. It seeks to bring persons into fellowship with God through Christ, to expose them to the influence of his Spirit, to teach them to know and to do his will, and so to promote their moral and spiritual growth and help to bring about that right order which we think of as the Kingdom of God. Its purpose is thus educational, in the deepest and truest sense of the term. There is no proper antithesis between evangelistic and educational ways of conceiving the function of the Christian Church. Not evangelism *or* education, is the alternative; the purpose and work of the church is that of evangelism *through* the moral and religious education of all, old and young, who come within the range of its influence. The church should be, in the best sense of the term, an educational institution; the minister, a teacher of the people.

The second principle, which follows directly from this, is that the preaching minister, the pastor-in-charge, of a church ought himself to be trained in the principles and methods of religious education. This is necessary in order that he may rightly conceive his own work and in order that he may, if he shares the work of the church with a director of religious education, understand and appreciate the director's duties and extend to him a full measure of sympathy and coöperation.

The third principle is that the director of religious education ought to be as well educated and prepared for his work as the preacher and pastor should be prepared for his work. Increasingly the terms "minister of education" or "teaching minister" are coming to be used; and

men are entering this field of service who have been trained in theological seminaries of graduate standing. It has been a justified criticism of much work in religious education that it concerned itself so exclusively with methods—*how* to teach—that it sometimes seemed in danger of forgetting that it is necessary to know thoroughly *what* to teach. The director of religious education who is qualified to be the teaching minister of the church which he serves must be as well trained in the Old and New Testaments—from the standpoints alike of history, literature, and theology, in Church history, in Christian doctrine, and in principles of Christian worship and Christian service, as the preaching minister and pastor. It means much, moreover, for the future of the Church that the men who are entering its pastoral service and those who are entering its teaching service should be trained in one and the same school, and take, in some cases, the same courses. It will help each to understand and appreciate the other's work. It will help the preacher and pastor to make his work more genuinely educational, and the director of religious education to be a real evangelist. And in those churches where the two men are called to work together, it will render easier their sympathetic co-operation.

I trust that this book may have a wide reading. I am sure that it will make a substantial contribution to the movement toward more effective Christian religious education in the Protestant churches of this land.

L. A. Weigle.

Yale University

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Introduction		v
Chapter I.	RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OUTGROWS LAY LEADERSHIP	1
Chapter II.	A NEW PROFESSION FINDING ITSELF	19
Chapter III.	A NEW CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH	41
Chapter IV.	THE DIRECTOR AS ORGANIZER	67
Chapter V.	THE DIRECTOR AS EXECUTIVE	89
Chapter VI.	THE DIRECTOR AS SUPERVISOR	118
Chapter VII.	THE DIRECTOR'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PASTOR	140
Chapter VIII.	THE DIRECTOR'S QUALIFICATIONS AND GROWTH	165
Chapter IX.	EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN THE SMALLER CHURCH	185
Bibliography		208

CHAPTER I

Religious Education Outgrows Lay Leadership

BOSTON in 1845 in an average public school of four hundred pupils gave sixty-five whippings a day, one whipping every six minutes. In that same year hundreds of rural schools in Massachusetts had to be abandoned because the pupils drove their teachers away. Massachusetts stood then probably at the top in our country." [1]

Thus an interpreter of present day public education reminds us of the distance we have traveled in less than a century in the spirit and method of education. In "the good old days," whatever other qualifications a school-teacher might possess or lack, he must have a strong physique and a commanding personality, for his first duty or function was to rule. Methodology in those days was chiefly concerned with discipline. Educational technique was a technique of conflict and coercive repression.

Here and there normal schools were beginning to appear and standards of teacher-training to

[1] Kilpatrick, William Heard, "Education for a Changing Civilization," p. 90. Macmillan, 1927.

develop. But emphasis was almost exclusively on subject matter, on the assumption that if a person knows a subject he can certainly teach it to others. Throughout the nineteenth century it was not uncommon for a student who had completed the work of a given school to pass a "teachers' examination" on its subject matter, and then without more training to become a teacher in that same school or one like it.

The majority of schools were in one-room buildings under one teacher. The ages of the students ranged from five to fifteen or sixteen. Attendance of the older students was interrupted frequently by work and of the younger students by illness and inclement weather, and the school term continued only half or two thirds of the year. It was under school conditions like these that most middle-aged persons of to-day began their educational careers.

In a community served by public schools with an educational viewpoint, a leadership, and teaching conditions such as these, it was not difficult for the Sunday School to compare quite favorably with the public school. The educational viewpoint was the same. The public school was concerned with knowledge of the subject matter of the "three R's." The Sunday School was concerned with knowledge of the subject matter of a "fourth R," religion, which subject matter consisted of the Bible. Its

teaching conditions were about the same. Its leadership was about as well trained for the task as it was then conceived as were public-school teachers. It may have had some advantage over the public school in that it supplied a larger number of leaders, making smaller groups possible, and it probably had an additional advantage since it was able clearly to wink at, or to throw back upon parents, the difficult problem of discipline which so vitiated the spirit of most public schools. On the whole as the child went back and forth from one school to the other there was little to make the Sunday School less attractive than the public school; probably in many ways it was more attractive.

The Sunday School movement started as a lay movement. Only gradually did it win the favor of the clergy sufficiently to turn their original opposition into tolerance and finally into approval of it as a legitimate agency of the Church. To this day the Sunday School has not outgrown that lay origin and its early emphasis on lay leadership. In fact, one of its finest contributions to the Church has been the provision of an outlet for motives of service and generosity on the part of Christian laymen. While there have been notable exceptions, the Sunday School program of the church has generally been strictly under the control of lay leadership, the attitude of the minister being one of

benevolent patronage or friendly aloofness. As long as the leadership of public education rose but little above the lay level, Sunday School leadership compared with it quite favorably. Under these conditions there was no thought of professionalizing the leadership of religious education.

Within a generation, however, the standards of leadership in general education have been drastically lifted. Normal colleges and university schools of education by the score are teeming with students preparing for a real professional career. The scientific method and point of view have come thoroughly to dominate the profession. Psychology, methodology, principles of education, tests and measurements, experimentation, and laboratory practice have come to comprise a new science, the science of education. Professional training takes for granted a mastery of the subject matter of the curriculum as prerequisite, and proceeds into a study of the principles and techniques of educational practice as these are determined by the nature of the pupil and the conditions governing the learning process. Education has become a science and its leadership a learned profession.

It would be easy to exaggerate at this point. Much public education is quite unscientific, and many of its leaders fall far below the rank of a skilled profession. Nothing is to be gained for

our purpose by assuming a perfection in the general practice of public education which its true professional leaders would be the first to disclaim. Education has a long way to travel before it is as effective as its prophets and seers know how to make it. It is quite enough to call attention to the steady upward trend in the standards governing public education, to the scientific temper of the more progressive schools and their leaders, and to the thoroughgoing reconstruction which is under way in many entire systems. While practice lags far behind theory, the present movement in public education is nothing short of a renaissance.

With this vast scientific movement under way in public education, it is evident that something similar must occur in Sunday School work or by comparison its standards will be greatly lowered. In the last analysis even a "standard" is a relative matter. Every piece of legislation lifting the standards of public education in a given state in effect lowers the prevailing standards of Sunday School work. The claim that a given Sunday School is doing better work to-day than it was doing twenty-five years ago means nothing. Its standard of comparison is not the Sunday School of the past but the general education of the present, in which many of its students are immersed.

Of course the teacher of religion may never

think to draw a comparison between her work and that of the public school. She may never visit ıe school grade in which her students spend the better part of five days a week. But the boy or girl who goes back and forth from one school to the other can scarcely avoid comparison even though it be unconscious. Out of every hour spent under a teacher fifty-nine minutes are spent with the public-school teacher. The other one minute is spent with the Church School teacher. In that one minute it is her task and privilege to interpret, spiritualize, and develop Christian motives for all the growth and enrichment which take place in the other fifty-nine minutes. She may ignore the bearing of the one upon the other, but if she does it cannot but be to the injury of the religion which she represents, and the religious impoverishment of the life committed to her leadership. A general renaissance in education must either catch religious education up with it and carry it forward, or it must leave it outworn and discarded by the wayside.

But new and exacting demands are made upon the Church's educational program by other influences besides the rapid progress in general education. Progress in many other fields has a similar effect in rendering past methods and materials of religious education quite obsolete. The changes which religious education seeks to produce in the

lives of its students must be brought about, so far as human instrumentalities are concerned, by appealing to the senses. It is by hearing and seeing, and by activities and responses stimulated through these means, that the experiences necessary to the desired changes are brought about. Within our own day facilities for effective, not to say alluring, appeal to the senses have been developed and increased to a degree all out of proportion to anything that has happened in the field of education in the stricter sense. With the motion picture, the "talkie," the radio, the flashy magazine, and the galaxy of modern advertising, the senses are bombarded from morning to night until they are surfeited to the point of insensibility.

A more serious problem for religious education than its unfavorable comparison with the standards of public education is the jaded sensibilities with which it must deal, if indeed it can make its appeal sufficiently attractive to get a chance at them at all. The theater brings all the imagery of ornate decoration, the witchery of changing light and color under almost magic control, and the spell of well-rendered music, to reënforce the appeal to the emotions of the actual drama itself. How far dare or must the church go in the worship setting which it provides to arouse and control for religious purposes these emotional mechanisms?

But it is not the part of the religious statesman or prophet to bemoan these developments which have rendered obsolete the program, method, and leadership of a bygone day. Rather, he rejoices at the clearer understanding of human nature and how it is remade, and at the effective and accurate means and methods for its remaking which have been made available for his purposes by the scientific movement in general education. Also, he rejoices at the new instruments of sense impression and influence, which have been so largely commercialized but are equally effective for religious purposes. The answer to this challenging situation is the modern movement in religious education which, in its own right, is bringing about a renaissance in the Church's educational program and a complete reconstruction in the method of Christian propaganda.

The moment we propose to put religious education on a sound and scientific basis, however, we set for ourselves the most difficult of all educational tasks. If inertia and actual resistance are being encountered in the movement to bring practice in general education to a level consistent with theory and objectives, certainly a greater inertia is encountered in the improvement of religious education both because of its high and elusive objectives and because of its largely voluntary leadership.

The aims or objectives of religious education are not fundamentally different from those of general education. The essential difference is that they go farther and involve those aspects of personality with which it is most difficult to deal objectively and with precision.

Education in general is concerned with the development of a socially desirable type of personality. Every real school is in the business of growing persons. It consists of a controlled situation in which experiences leading to the desired type of personality are most likely to occur, or in fact are actually brought about. Many of these desired personality traits are simple and almost mechanical in nature. Skills in writing, in using tools, and in discovering needed information are readily developed through guided practice. The habit of courtesy, the disposition to play the game fairly and with good sportsmanship, and reliability in carrying through a proposed enterprise are more complex and more difficult to direct and control. With all such characteristics, however, general education can deal. The temptation is always to degenerate into the easier process of hearing lessons, of drill, and of giving information. But the better type of public school consistently works at the real job of personality development. It can carry this process a long way into the realm of

character education and personal and social efficiency.

When it comes, however, to the last, climacteric step in the process, that point at which religious experience emerges as the creator of motives and the definer of ideals and values, the public school yields the responsibility and privilege of this culmination of the whole educational process to the Church. It is in religious education that all true education finds its ultimate fulfillment.

Religious education possesses the one perfect embodiment of character—the one Person in whom personality ideals become concrete and vital. Religious education draws upon the one type of experience which has the largest resources for the creation of noble motives—the experience of worship. Possessing these unique resources religious education dares to set its goals beyond those of general education. And yonder they lie, out in the realm of spiritual achievement, beyond any hope of attainment except through vital religious experience. Certainly they lie beyond the curriculum and purpose of public education.

But in this spiritual realm the educational process makes more exacting demands upon its leadership, and creates more problems as to method and materials than on any lower level. The measurement of results is more difficult, for the desired

outcomes themselves are elusive. The improvement of the process is rendered, therefore, the more difficult, for even the expert must speak with modesty and caution. Inertia is far more firmly entrenched than would be the case if the process were more objective, simple, and demonstrable.

Public education is able to bring much pressure to bear in improving backward situations. Vocational motives account for much teacher-training and response to constructive supervision. In the Church School, however, leadership is voluntary. Pressure to take training and to improve practice must be exerted with consummate tact or it may result in several possible tragic outcomes. Leaders may resign, or they may organize opposition against the innovator, or they may develop a sulky spirit which vitiates any spiritual values the school might have.

It is not the purpose of this analysis to discourage those who are attempting to improve the work of their own Church Schools, but rather to help them to get an estimate of the full magnitude of the task and so better enable them to prepare for a long and arduous siege. No adventurous and spectacular charge will take this stronghold of inertia. If real religious education is the most difficult aspect of all education, then improvement of it under voluntary leadership is preëminently difficult.

It has become almost a popular sport for local Church School workers, field men, pastors, and others "up against the actual situation in the local church," to berate the professional religious educator as a "highbrow" who is a totally impractical theorist because he insists on setting high standards for the Church School. In many instances the charge has no doubt been justified because of the detachment of college professors and national administrators from continuous first-hand contact with typical local churches. There is no disposition here to plead a case for the profession as a whole. There are doubtless many hard facts in local situations which must be taken into account in applying the principles of sound and effective religious education to them.

There are, however, a few facts frequently overlooked by these local "practical" workers which will be ignored only to the undoing of our whole religious enterprise. Fact number one is that religious education, if it is to be fruitful and worthy of its task, is the most difficult and exacting of all educational processes. To attempt it with inferior leadership and facilities is to invite tragic failure. The church which is unwilling to face this trying responsibility had best surrender its claims to the allegiance and confidence of youth.

Fact number two is that the church to-day is part

of a rapidly changing world. Among the most significant of the changes under way are those in the field of general education and in the broader and perhaps more influential sources from whence come the vivid sense impressions of the growing generation—our amusements, press, radio, and advertisements. For the church to fail to make corresponding improvements in its program of education is for it to abdicate its teaching function entirely, for it will soon find its classrooms deserted.

Fact number three is that the church which invites students into its school assumes a serious responsibility to them and to the community. Children and adults alike are protected by law against medical malpractice, against contaminated milk, against illiteracy, against fakes and swindlers of all sorts. Only the conscience of the church can protect them against spiritual malpractice, against fake religious notions, and harmful religious attitudes, or against so-called spiritual illiteracy. The proposal to set up standards of Church School work is simply a proposal to protect the spiritual welfare of those who come within reach of the church. Local workers may question the particular requirements in such standards, but that drastic improvements in Church School work are long overdue in most communities is not open to question. Standards, better curriculums, leadership

training, and supervision are means made available for the local church to use in meeting the grave responsibility of being in the educational business.

Fact number four is that, where there is a will, the program of the Church School can be decidedly improved. It has been done in scores of churches. Hundreds of others have condoned continued malpractice and inefficiency simply because they were unwilling to pay the price of improvement. In the most underprivileged one-room school, leadership training, supervised reading, new viewpoints, and definite standards or goals can work wonders in bringing the Church School abreast of its real task.

The danger to religion and Church School work is not the high ideals and the "impractical theories" of the highbrow. It is the deadly complacency and inertia of the "lowbrow," who glories in his inefficiency and ignorance as themselves evidence that he is doing his best under the circumstances.

If eating were merely a matter of taste or opinion or personal whim, rather than the very requisite of life itself, then the breadwinner of the family might well deliberate whether to make the necessary effort to secure food for those dependent upon him. If an adequate program of religious education were a mere fad or luxury, then

the church leader might well deliberate whether it be worth the effort to develop and provide such a program. The moment we grant that spiritual life and growth depend upon such a program we have rendered foolish any question as to the obligation and value of providing it, whatever the cost in effort and sacrifice.

It is perfectly clear that drastic improvements at a more rapid rate in Church School work generally are overdue. It is equally clear that the means and methods by which such improvements can be brought about are rapidly becoming available through denominational and interdenominational professional leaders. It is becoming clear also that there is a yawning gulf between the ideals, the standards, the methods, and even the vocabulary of the professional worker at the top and the nonprofessional worker in the local Church School who constitutes the actual cutting edge of the process. The professional is impatient at the inertia of the local worker. The local worker is either stolidly indifferent in his complacency or is impatient with the impractical theories and impossible standards of the professional.

Absentee treatment or long-range supervision on the part of the professional is too diffused and intermittent to cause very satisfactory progress in improving the local situation. How is this gulf to

be bridged? On one side is the fine modern program of religious education which could do so great a service for the local church if only it could get out of the hands of the professionals and into operation. On the other side is the local situation in which the improved program is so much needed but so little desired. The answer to this question is a new profession—the local church professional educator. If religious education becomes adequate to the day in which we live it will in a measure inevitably outgrow its exclusively local lay leadership.

The name "director of religious education" has come to be applied commonly to this new profession. The director of religious education is a technically trained religious educator employed by the local church to have general charge of the educational aspects of its total program, and standing beside the minister as a professional member of the church staff. He is able to maintain continuous and intimate contacts with the local situation, and as a leader of leaders gradually introduces such educational improvements into the church's program as to make it scientifically sound and spiritually effective. His training and continued professional contacts keep him in touch with all that is best in the developing science of religious education. His contacts with the local work

enable him to reconstruct its processes gradually and tactfully until it approximates the standards for effective and fruitful work. Thus he bridges the gap between the professional at the top, whose research and creativity are indispensable to a modern program, and the local worker, who forms the actual contact with growing life.

Unless the church is to abdicate her educational function, and with it her opportunity to have a creative and determining influence on the growing generation, such a profession as this seems quite indispensable in the modern church.

The majority of churches, however, cannot hope to employ a dual professional leadership. The hope of the smaller church which cannot support a professional staff lies in one of two directions. First, there may be a redefinition of the functions and qualifications of the ministry. This new type of ministry would be trained and qualified to introduce sound educational method into the total program of the church, including adequate provision for all age groups. As careful pastoral oversight would be given to children and young people as to adults. As much care would be taken in providing an effective teaching staff for all groups as in providing an effective pulpit ministry. This is the ideal solution for the smaller church. Second, professional supervision might be provided by coöperation

with a number of other churches in the employment of a joint director of religious education. Chapter IX will deal more fully with this possibility.

The church which can support employed leadership will obviously make an educational specialist a member of the staff as director or minister of religious education and will look to him for guidance in bringing its total program to a sound educational basis. The functions, relationships, and qualifications of this comparatively new type of professional leader are the subjects of the following chapters. They are not without numerous interesting problems, as many a local situation could testify.

CHAPTER II

A New Profession Finding Itself

RELIGIOUS leadership is probably the oldest of all professions. In the most primitive society the medicine man or witch doctor enjoys unique professional prestige. On a little higher level of society he becomes a holy man revered for the special favor which he has won from the deity. Then as civilization develops he becomes a priest representing the people before God. In our day this same venerable profession is known as the ministry.

While not regarded with the awe with which primitive people regard their professional religious leaders, the ordained minister still occupies a unique position of prestige and privilege in our society. Many courtesies, such as reduced railroad rates, discounts at stores and hotels, and complimentary baseball or theater tickets, are given to ministers not to honor them as individuals but in recognition of their profession. The high regard in which the profession is held is indicated by the sensation created when a member of it suddenly reveals himself as unworthy.

A man who enters the ministry, receiving the ordination of the Church, has back of him the long history of this, the "highest calling," and to support him the strong predispositions of the Church membership in favor of the profession which he represents.

With the director of religious education the opposite is the case, at least in so far as his profession is definitely distinguished from the regular ministry. The profession is an innovation. The functions which it is to discharge likewise involve in many respects changes in the old order. These are not always welcomed by those affected. Wherever the fault may be, the profession is reputed to have a good many failures reckoned against it. The specific functions and services to be rendered by the profession are poorly defined or uncertain. On the whole the development of a new type of professional leadership in the Church to take its place alongside such a venerable profession as the ministry is fraught with many vexing problems.

The first of these is the attitude of the regular ministry. This whole matter of relationships between director and minister must be treated after the functions of the director have been discussed. Suffice it to say here that it is hardly to be expected that a distinct and new profession could develop alongside a profession with the standing of the

ministry without at least a slight sense of uneasiness on the part of the latter. Particularly is this true when the new profession necessarily deals with institutions and programs in which the ministry has long enjoyed exclusive professional authority and leadership. Furthermore it is the avowed conviction and policy of the new profession that its function is to introduce a method of religious leadership which will ultimately reconstruct the total church program. There is rather more than an implication that the profession of the ministry itself, with all its centuries of standing, may be quite profoundly affected by the successful application of the new method. The ministry would indeed be endowed with a peculiar professional consciousness, to see all this impending and yet to say to the new profession, "Come on, the field is yours."

The fact that so many ministers have welcomed directors as colaborers, and have even insisted that their churches call them, is not due to a disposition to be displaced by a new profession, or even to be very vitally affected by it. Rather it is due to the fact that most ministers have not realized how fundamental and far-reaching in the church's total program this new profession considers its functions and program to be. It is the belated discovery of these ambitious outreachings of the new

program of religious education that has in many cases caused the attitude of the minister to change decidedly after the director was on the job and seemed to be making good. This change of attitude has sometimes been mistaken as jealousy on the part of the minister because of the successful leadership of a colleague in his own church. It is more kind, and probably more true in most cases, to say that it was due rather to a sense of trepidation or alarm when the full implications of a thoroughly educational church program began to become apparent. It is a fair guess that ministers who have never worked with real professional educators are generally more in favor of the rapid spread of the new profession than are those who have had first-hand experience with it.

The financial cost of adding a second professional worker and his needed secretarial help to the staff of a church is a serious hindrance to the extension of the profession. Even churches which could well afford to provide such leadership are likely to hesitate at the salary expected by a man to do work which, as the membership supposes, has always been done in leisure time by volunteer and largely untrained workers. The cost of an able pulpiteer, of good music, and of janitor service will not be questioned, because quite obviously these are specialized activities which could not be

expected of voluntary workers. But to pay a high salary to a man for "running the Sunday School" is beyond the comprehension of the average pew-holder or church official.

Even though the necessary funds can be secured to call a director, the first financial stringency is likely to raise the question as to whether this is not the easiest place to make a cut. Particularly is this true if those who control financial policies have not been kept in close and intelligent contact with what the director is accomplishing.

The general educational consciousness in most churches is rather faint and wavering. Other methods of getting so-called results have been employed so long, and with such apparent statistical results, that religious education even though important seems rather like a harmless side issue to be carried by a group who seem to enjoy it. It has seldom claimed the center of attention to the degree that great "protracted meetings," membership drives, and building campaigns have. A sense of dire need for real educational leadership must be created throughout the congregation before support for a director will be available. Usually only the minister can disturb complacency with the existing program sufficiently to create sentiment for the calling of such a leader. After the director is on the job, he will have continually to convince the

congregation that he is rendering an indispensable service in order to maintain their support. The burden rests on him to prove his right to exist, while the minister, however ineffective or fruitless his labors, will be taken for granted—if not the man, at least his profession.

Voluntary workers may resent the innovations of the professional, and the new demands upon their efforts and time created by his higher goals and more exacting standards of work. The utmost tact will be required to get them to accept his counsel and constructive suggestions. A voluntary superintendent, by the giving of his own time and devotion, wins a leverage upon the devotion of his voluntary colleagues and helpers which an employed worker must secure in some other way.

If the director has true educational ideals he cannot accept the standards of success which have prevailed in the past. As a rule the commonly accepted evidence of successful Sunday School work has been increase in gross attendance. Such improvements in the quality of the program as result from the director's efforts have in many cases actually built up the school numerically in a very satisfactory manner. However, this cannot be a sudden outcome; nor can attention be focused upon numbers as such, for this would mean a sacrifice of more fundamental values.

During the time taken to cultivate an appreciation for the fruitage of a genuinely educational program both on the part of his workers and of the church at large, the director has the problem of maintaining confidence in his leadership and in the worth-whileness of his program. Thoroughly sincere and devoted persons may anxiously question the expenditure of funds all out of proportion to what the traditional Sunday School has cost, when so far as they can measure or appreciate them, the results seem almost negligible.

It is not uncommon for a director to face an even more serious situation than that of failure to show within a few months tangible results in terms which the church as a whole can appreciate. He finds, when he begins to analyze his situation, that the Church School has a background of emphasis on contests and other attendance devices which through pressure and artificial motives have succeeded in developing a continuously growing attendance. In fact, it may be as the climax of some "successful" booster campaign that the director is called. This is one of the easiest ways to work up the necessary enthusiasm for such a progressive step. The director takes hold of the situation and immediately shifts attention and emphasis from attendance to qualitative aspects of the work. The customary attendance pressure is relaxed by this emphasis

on other factors. Before the sheer merit of the improved program begins to attract more regular attendance and new students so as to affect reports favorably, the decrease in artificial pressure affects them unfavorably. At the end of his first six months or year the director must actually report a decreased average attendance. Whatever other values he may report they will scarcely offset this one item which even he who runs may read. By the only reports which he is able to make the church at large really comprehend, the director is worse than a failure. His influence has actually decreased attendance. This is not a theoretical situation. It has actually confronted more than one director of the finest educational type.

The above difficulty grows in part out of the failure of the church as a whole either to define clearly its purposes in calling a director, or to hold the same purpose as a religious educational specialist is certain to have. This indefiniteness or misunderstanding in functions results in mutual disappointment when the work actually gets under way. The director is unable to secure full coöperation in the type of work he wishes carried out, and the church does not see the immediate tangible results which the investment was expected to bring.

As a result of such mutual dissatisfaction the director's tenure of office has usually been short.

When compared with the length of pastorates in general it shows a seriously lower average, but when compared with the tenure of pastors in the type of churches employing directors it constitutes an apparently grave reflection upon the newer profession. Furthermore a short tenure of office for a director is even more serious than for a regular pastor for the reason that the educational method is so gradual both in being introduced and in carrying its processes through to the desired outcomes. As some one has said, "you can't make culture hum." However promising the final fruitage of an educational program may be, it cannot be ripened by short-term and forced methods. The profession faces the impossible situation, therefore, of carrying out an essentially long-term process under enforced short-term conditions.

The fostering of a vocational consciousness and zeal for professional recognition has been sufficiently prevalent among the graduates of at least some of the schools of religious education to result in an unfavorable reaction on the part of ministers and churches. Directors have no doubt been frequently thrown on the defensive by those who had no proper conception of their functions and little respect for their professional training. In this difficult situation the professional dignity and self-assertion which would have been quite taken

for granted on the part of those of a well established profession, have been misinterpreted as priggishness or conceit or unwarranted pride. The fact that many directors have been considerably younger than the employed leadership to which the churches were accustomed has increased the difficulty.

When we come to an analysis of the function of a director it will be apparent that the vocation by its very nature is most exacting. Many of the high personal qualities expected in the minister are to be expected in the director also; otherwise he suffers by comparison. In addition to this, the nature of the director's work brings him into relationships, both with the pastor and with the Church School staff, of a kind more difficult and more fraught with danger of misunderstanding than the relationships sustained by the pastor in the ordinary situation. The whole art of improving through supervision and personal counseling the quality of the teaching work done by a voluntary staff brings to the director problems of tact, patience, and resourcefulness of the most trying sort. In many cases the personal acumen of the director has been not quite equal to these demands. He has been unable to keep constructive suggestions from being interpreted as faultfinding and his attempts to help in a purely professional way have seemed to imply

personal criticism. The charge that an inferior type of person has been attracted to religious education as a vocation is based more upon an underestimate of the exacting demands of the profession than upon facts regarding the real caliber of people in it. Of course it is true that this profession, like the regular ministry, has suffered from its unworthy or incapable members. There is no ready way in which to refute the impression which is somewhat prevalent that the proportion of incompetents among directors is greater than among pastors. Neither can it be proved.

This recital of the problems which are being faced by the new profession in finding itself is not to be interpreted as evidence that the attempt to develop such a profession has been misguided and fruitless. Neither does it imply that every director has faced all of these problems. There are doubtless numerous directors who will be surprised even to hear of some of them. Happily there are many whose standing and functions are intelligently accepted and whole-heartedly supported by their pastor colleagues and by their churches. A clear understanding of the typical problems and the ways of meeting them is the best way of extending this fortunate situation to many other churches and directors.

In order that the profession may secure its

proper place, both of recognition and of service, several conditions must be met. It is no reflection upon the high type of personnel now engaged in the profession to say that a still higher type is much needed. The same statement could be made about any profession, particularly in the fields of religion and education. Because the profession is new and not yet very thoroughly standardized, it is especially important that the personnel be of such a type as shall win recognition by sheer worth, and shall establish the standards on that high plane required by the functions and responsibilities.

Among the personal qualities most essential are humility, vital personal religious experience, appreciation of others, a disposition for teamwork, consummate tact coupled with frankness, and willingness to die for a cause if need be without display of martyrdom. In so far as difficulties are traceable to personal qualities, many of those encountered have been due to lack in one or more of the above.

On the part of the church, a new conception of its total function and program, particularly of its basic method, is needed by most churches as a necessary condition for the fruitful leadership of a director. The church must interpret itself as a school in Christian living before it is ready to face fully its educational task and opportunity. The

full content and meaning of this ideal will probably become clear only under the director's prophetic leading. It cannot very well be grasped in the abstract. The program developed under a skilled director will demonstrate the ideal far better than any preliminary study of aims or program could define it. The essential is not that the church shall fully grasp this new conception of the church before calling a director, but rather that it shall be open-minded, eagerly questing for a larger understanding of its nature and function, and trusting its director and pastor together to lead it into this higher conception.

For the director and pastor together must do this. Unless the pastor is prepared and willing to have his congregation rethink its whole nature and function in the light of the power of the educational method, it is unlikely that he will give the director opportunity to render his largest service. It is questionable, also, whether he wants a director.

A necessary condition for the director's efficient service is a clear definition of his functions and of his place in the total church program. It would be a most effective educational procedure, before a director is called, for the pastor, the church board of officers or session, and the Church School Council or Educational Committee, including probably the Church School staff, to make a study of

the whole church program—its aims, its methods, and the agencies or organizations involved. The International Standard known as "The Educational Work of the Church" would be a most effective guide for such a study.

This study ought to have as its purpose, not the definite reconstruction of the program or in fact any immediate changes, but rather an understanding of what a modern church program is when it takes account of the resources of the educational method. On the basis of this understanding a statement of the purpose of calling a director should be formulated and some of the major responsibilities he would be expected to carry. It is the purpose of Chapters IV, V, and VI to assist in understanding these functions and in defining them.

The next step in this study would be some outline of the director's relationships to the pastor, to the Church School superintendent and his entire staff, to the Educational Committee or Church School Council, to the board of officers or session, to the entire congregation, and to all the affiliated agencies which participate in the religious educational process. It would be quite possible here to draw a diagram or blue print expressing an opinion as to just what these relationships should be. The definition will be far more satisfactory, however, if it is worked out in conference on the basis of

principles made clear in the following chapters, and specifically in the light of the particular local needs and conditions. A plan of functions and relationships which develops out of such a first-hand self-study may not be so ideal as a general blue print and yet be far more effective than a more perfect plan taken over bodily from a book or another situation.

Before calling a director a church should count the cost. The director's salary and office help should be underwritten on a permanent basis, not merely secured as special pledges as though to meet a temporary emergency. Not only should the director's salary and operating expenses be put on a stable and permanent basis but the church should face the probability that the type of program he will develop will be richer and more comprehensive, calling for increasing materials and equipment. The director must be given adequate working conditions and facilities or his employment will be like calling an artisan without providing for him the necessary tools and materials with which to ply his craft.

With these preliminary steps the church is in a position to get in touch with a prospective director. He ought to be on the ground at least for conferences while these preliminary preparations are yet under way. There should be a free interchange

of views between him and his prospective fellow workers before the call has really been consummated, not in a bargaining spirit or in the sense of coming to terms, but rather in the interests of full and frank mutual understanding. It would be ideal, of course, to have the definition of functions and relationships a joint product of conference between the director and his prospective coworkers. At least this should remain in a tentative and flexible form until such conference is possible.

It may be objected to the above preliminary steps that, while all this study and conference is very good, the director himself should lead this after he is on the job. It is one of his first duties to give the church this guidance. There are two objections, however, to leaving this definition of functions and relationships until the director is able to guide the whole process himself. In the first place, it places him in a most embarrassing position because functions and particular relationships will now be considered in terms of personalities rather than on principle. His own stand, even though quite justified, is likely to be misinterpreted as overambition on his part for rank and recognition. If he be overmodest he may acquiesce in statements or positions which are certain later to cramp and embarrass him and interfere with his best work. Many of these issues are better faced

beforehand on the basis of a hypothetical director, or by the prospective director in conference with church leaders on the basis of a possible call, than after the call has actually been accepted.

A second objection to calling a director without a thorough preliminary study of functions and relationships is that the group of church leaders unwilling or unable to make such a study is very unlikely to give a director the active support that he must have in order to succeed. This effort and study to understand the modern educational method when applied to the church program will be an earnest of the seriousness with which the work of the director is to be taken, and of the support that he will be given.

The church whose leaders feel unable or unqualified to carry through such a study by themselves would do well to call for a series of conferences on the matter with a field director or superintendent or other religious educational specialist. These leaders should prepare to do some reading, as suggested by the visiting specialist, and should understand that there is no purely effortless way of understanding the modern Church School.

Among the conditions necessary to enable the new profession really to find itself is the question of the director's ordination. History has so

thoroughly established the principle of lay educational leadership in the church that religious education has tended to develop as a profession outside of the ordained ministry rather than within it. Devout laymen who would never aspire to be "men of the cloth," have seen here an outlet for Christian vocational ideals. Others who for one reason or another have had a strong inclination to enter the ministry but have been dissuaded by various seeming drawbacks in the profession or in their qualifications have found here a type of service closely akin but more satisfactory. Should these religious education specialists be ordained?

The answers will depend somewhat upon just what significance a given Church attaches to ordination. The case for ordination of a professional educational leadership for the Church seems about as strong as for that of the pastoral leadership. Religious education is one method and preaching and pastoral work is another method of carrying out exactly the same purposes. It is difficult to see how one method is more sacred or fraught with holier responsibility than the other. Certainly there ought to be no difference in spiritual qualifications for the two functions. If it is a question of "the fitness of things" there seems no reason why the director should not be ordained.

In giving the educational method and function

its proper recognition and in placing upon its leaders their grave responsibility, ordination seems to have definite value. Lack of it carries unfortunate and untrue implications of inferiority. Whether this raises the director to the same rank as the pastor is a question to be reserved until their relationships are discussed.

Closely related to the matter of ordination, and a definite factor in giving the new profession its proper standing, is the question of title. A variety of titles are in use other than the one we have here been using. Among them are educational director, educational minister, educational supervisor, minister of education, associate pastor, and assistant pastor, the last two being used in some cases where educational supervision is the major function though commonly used with more general meaning.

It is not likely that the term "director of religious education" will soon be displaced, though there are objections to it. The term implies administration of machinery and activities more strongly than the more definitely spiritual functions. It implies a function somewhat inferior to the ministry and thereby handicaps the profession. The writer must confess a preference for the coördinate terms "pastoral minister" and "educational minister." The organizational machinery of a modern church is becoming so heavy that there may develop a third

type of ministry, the executive or administrative ministry. The terms to be used should be considered as a part of the preliminary study involved in the calling of a professional educational leader.

As the new profession is finding itself, a number of general conditions need to be kept in mind in addition to those inherent in the director himself and in the local church which calls him. Religious education as a science is yet in its infancy. Failure to recognize this has caused some of its most ardent protagonists in their enthusiasm to go somewhat beyond what the facts warrant in their claims, or to give questionable direction to some of its developments.

Religious education must develop on its own resources and in its own way. The objectives, methods, instruments, and organization of public education have very great significance for the new program. They form an indispensable background for much of its work. But they cannot be taken over bodily; nor can they be closely followed in many respects. They are themselves too tentative and imperfect, and even though they were perfected, there is no reason to suppose that they would serve equally well the purposes of religious education. We shall not develop the new science of religious education merely or chiefly by imitation of public education.

Religious education must be reserved in its claims and humble in its attitudes, probably always, but certainly until we have made vastly more progress toward a really scientific procedure. It must have an attitude of appreciation toward elements in the church program which have long standing, such as preaching, pastoral calling, and ordinances. They are not to be lightly cast aside for practices which have had scant testing. Rather, the new methods and program elements should come to reenforce all that is permanent and worthy in the old. Coupled with this regard for elements of the past must be a sincere and eager search for more effective means of spiritual development or for a more effective use of the traditional means. On the whole the new program and profession will do well to emphasize how much they have in common with the long history of the Church rather than their radically new aspects. Let the new be present but not predominant.

Religious education will be both more scientific and more Christian in its attitudes and spirit when it is more sensitive to the failures and inadequacies in its own program than to those in the traditional church program.

The sounding of these warnings is not to imply that substantial progress toward a real science of religious education is not being made. The work

of the Religious Education Association may be called the pioneer effort toward a truly scientific basis for religious education. Now a number of the denominational boards have departments of research and staffs of age-group and functional specialists developing ever more accurate and effective means, methods, and materials.

Coöperative efforts in this field are conducted through the International Council of Religious Education, whose Department of Research includes its entire staff of over a dozen specialists in various types of work. Graduate schools and seminaries are likewise making a contribution in research.

Since the local church educator is dependent upon the results of the research enterprises, and they in turn depend upon him for experimentation and validation of results, he should keep closely in touch with these general agencies of the profession. The Director's Professional Advisory Section of the International Council of Religious Education is an effective medium for this contact.

The outlook for the profession is perhaps not so bright to-day as it was supposed to be a decade ago in its early stages. It was easy then to visualize the sweep of the new profession until a director of religious education should be deemed as indispensable as a pastor to the local church program. This is a highly improbable dream.

CHAPTER III

A New Conception of the Church

OUR MODERN democratic public educational system was born out of a new conception of the State. As long as the political ideal was autocratic, education was for the classes but not for the masses. The State was little concerned with it. Ignorant subjects were supposedly more easily controlled than enlightened subjects. Education prepared men to rule. Such education as reached the masses prepared them for subjection. Thus education, such as it was, served to perpetuate the system.

But with the dawn of the democratic ideal and the right of universal suffrage came naturally the dream of universal education. In fact, it was more than a dream; it was a grim necessity in order to safeguard the State from the autocracy of ignorance. As an early American statesman said, "we must meet the dangers of universal suffrage with universal education."

The right of the State to assume the educational function was not conceded without a struggle.

Cubberley [1] lists as one of the seven great battles to make possible our present public-school system, "the battle for freedom from sectarian control." That battle has been so well won that our present educational system is not only unhampered by sectarian influence; it is impaired by the implied negation of religion altogether. At present education in America is quite thoroughly an instrument of the State.

The full significance of this is illustrated by the slogan of William von Humboldt, Prussian Minister of Education: "What you would put into the State, first put into the school." On this principle the educational system of Germany was thoroughly militarized. In a generation Germany was converted into a military camp and the very character and disposition of her people were changed. Thus it is possible for universal education to become a more powerful instrument of autocracy than is available in a system in which the masses are kept in ignorance. Education as a political instrument wields sinister power.

But is this education? Surely it is but a caricature of what true education ought to be. Public education in America has before it another battle before the old statecraft of intrigue and privilege

[1] Cubberley, Ellwood Patterson, "Public Education in the United States." Houghton Mifflin, 1919.

entirely gives way to the new statecraft of creative education. For when education is a transmissive process for the preservation of the *status quo* it is little better than coercive control. The power of education to create a national type is well established. The prerogative of education itself, rather than of politics or big business or capitalistic philanthropists, to determine what that type shall be is yet to be conceded by the nation as a whole. Education as a means of preserving and passing on the social heritage is unquestioned. But education as a means of creating a new type of society is yet to be generally accepted. Still it is only on this creative level that education comes into its own.

The development of the democratic ideal of the State and the consequent or perhaps reciprocal growth of a great democratic public educational system has its analogy in the religious field. An essentially new conception of the Church underlies the vigorous growth of modern religious education.

When the Church is conceived as an "ark of salvation" its dealings with the individual are readily interpreted as a transaction which changes his status from that of being "lost" to that of being "saved." Or the Church militant, considered as the "army of the Lord," is primarily concerned

with enlistment of recruits, development of morale for the conflict, and individual or group battles with "the enemy." The Church conceived of in political terms as a religious state or government is concerned chiefly with the terms, rights, and duties of citizenship and with legalistic relationships. Any of these conceptions at its best may have real spiritual values, but so often, as history records and observation proves, each conception has degenerated into crass mechanical interpretations and made its appeal to prejudices and motives of self-interest and bigotry.

Many forces have combined to render such conceptions inadequate or untenable. Psychology has given us interpretations of the causes and factors contributing to the dramatic, emotional religious experiences which were formerly valued highly as evidences of divine operation and favor, so that much of the mystery has been removed. Other less spasmodic types of religious experience have come to claim a relatively much greater appreciation. Psychology has not eliminated the divine forces in religious experience, but it has taught us to associate or identify these forces with a much broader scope of experiences. It has at least raised serious question about the value or necessity of some of the more violent types of experience, and has certainly encouraged us to look to normal

rather than abnormal experiences for the evidences of the religious life and divine favor.

The increasing complexity of our social order has been the occasion for the development among Christians of a marked social consciousness. The necessity of expressing the religious life in social relationships has appeared. At the same time a restudy of the teachings of Jesus has revealed their dominantly social purposes and applications. The Kingdom of God is no longer interpreted in terms of the Apocalypse but in terms of the Sermon on the Mount. It is not a miraculous, otherworldly endowment but an ethical and spiritual achievement in human society. The old individualistic patterns of theology have become quite inadequate. No transaction in, by, or through the church can "save" the individual apart from his own responsible relationships with his fellow men. This calls for a more Scriptural conception of the Church.

The historical method of Bible study, with its fresh, open-minded approach and its determination to discover the factual background of our sacred literature, has given us virtually a fresh Bible. To be sure, many of the supposed values in the old Bible have been changed. But this has only cleared the ground for the emergence of new values which relate Biblical ideals to life in a much more dynamic and creative way. We know Jesus better

than any generation since his time has known him. In many ways we know him better than did even his own generation. Searching his sayings not for proof texts but for principles, we find him little concerned with many of the institutional interests which have claimed the Church's major attention. We find him deeply concerned with life, with the art of living, with human relationships. He was a teacher—not an organizer, a promoter, or an institutional genius. A simple, informal discipleship or class was all that he left to embody and perpetuate his purpose.

There is widespread dissatisfaction among Christian people, as well there may be, over the kind of Church we have to-day as the result of past conceptions and policies. It is a Church which is torn asunder into scores of parties, competing, overlapping, and inefficient, because the formal and rigid conceptions of the past made no provision for variant experiences and differing opinions. Its membership is for the most part incapable of participating intelligently and skillfully in the conduct of its own institutional program, to say nothing of offering qualified Christian leadership to many community enterprises which might thereby become powerful allies. The pastor finds his congregation a field instead of a force. The major efforts of himself and his official board are exerted

in the interests of the self-perpetuation of the institution.

It is not surprising that a new conception of the Church is emerging under the urge of all these factors. It would be foolhardy to predict just what conception of itself the Church of to-morrow will have. Probably there will be many different types. We suggest one type here which seems to meet those weaknesses in the traditional Church which have been revealed by the foregoing factors. It seems to provide a pattern of the Church which is thoroughly in accord with the formative social forces of our day. And it is the only pattern which gives the professional leader in religious education an adequate opportunity to render his largest service in the local church. We propose to consider the Church—the total Church itself, not merely some of its affiliated agencies—as a school in Christian living.

Of course it would be possible for the Church, as traditionally conceived or as conceived in some other pattern in the future, to make large use of the teaching method. Transmissive education or indoctrination could be made a powerful instrument in preserving the existing obsolete pattern of the Church, or in creating a new pattern which might itself violate sound educational principles. Von Humboldt's slogan may be paraphrased for

the Church: "What you would put into the Church, first put into the Church's school." Then religious education will be just as creatively Christian or just as deadly dogmatic as its leaders will to make it. In this case the Church does not itself become a school—a disciplehood. It uses a school for institutional purposes. Just as in the State school system the fight has yet to be won to make education genuinely creative and to make the schools of the State the means of its own continuous re-creation, so in the Church religious education has yet to be lifted from its place as an instrument of institutional preservation to a place as the Church's basic method of institutional life and re-creation.

It is the purpose of the Church to develop persons so Christlike that they will tend to transform society itself into the Kingdom of God. Personality develops through experience. In developing its desired type of personality the Church has but to see to it that growing persons have the requisite experiences. The provision of these experiences forms the Church's program.

The above purpose could be stated in much greater detail and could perhaps be more gracefully and accurately phrased. But it will be found that the absolute essentials of the Church's purpose are covered in it and that the Church's essential program is likewise comprehended by the provision

of the experiences necessary to develop the desired type of person. It will also be found that in however detailed form the objectives or purposes of the Church may be stated, they are all essentially educational purposes. They involve effecting desirable changes in persons, and this is exactly what education is. These objectives are to be realized by providing certain requisite experiences. But the provision of a program of experiences directed toward desired outcomes is an educational curriculum. It is clear, therefore, that religious education is not simply one of the many duties and functions which the Church performs. It is not simply the Church's program for childhood and youth. It is not a mere means of indoctrination and recruitment. Religious education is the basic method by which the Church undertakes all its functions. It is the method of a total program.

This conception of religious education as an approach to the total Church program does not mean that Sunday School work will now expand and swallow up the sermon, the church worship, the midweek meeting, and the pastoral calling. It does not mean that the director of religious education will now run the whole church while the pastor is an onlooker. Far from it! It means that instead of two programs—a church program and an educational program—there will be one program,

the program of the church. This, however, will be soundly educational throughout, and will provide with equal care and leadership for all age groups, certainly without discrimination against the younger. It means that, instead of abandoning the educational function and method to a group of auxiliary organizations, which are given to dissipating loyalties and pressing the claims of special interests, a church will now carry out, under its own name, for its total constituency, a comprehensive program soundly educational throughout.

The approach to this new type of church is not organizational but rather through a vital growth process. Perhaps the first test of the possibility of bringing a given church to this new kind of conception of itself is to be made by undertaking an educational approach to it. Education means to effect desirable changes in persons. Some persons will need to be changed, in the average church, before such a conception of the church as a school in Christian living as we are setting forth can be realized. But we who believe in the educational method and advocate it for the total Church should be the last to neglect it or violate it in accomplishing our purposes. It will take time and patience to effect sufficient changes even to make faint beginnings of the new type of program possible, but

if creative education once gets its start the future is assured.

The first step is a study by the Church of just what it is trying to do—its basic purposes. Why should it be continued? [1] Is it rendering to society a service commensurate with what it costs in time, talents, energy, and funds to keep it going? If so, specifically what is that service which it is rendering? Could the service be better provided in some other way if the institution were to become nonexistent? Are the purposes of this particular church all that they should be? Will they stand critical evaluation by a disinterested party? What more worthy purposes could be adopted?

Not many churches have clearly defined objectives which the local congregation has actually made its own. They continue year after year on the momentum of past history on the assumption that the perpetuation of the institution is the issue of major concern in policy formulation and program-building. It will be revealing and perhaps a bit humiliating to review the major activities of the past few years in the local church and to discover, provided the real basic motives are frankly admitted, how largely they have been in the interests

[1] A discussion outline, "Are There Too Many Churches in Our Town," supplied by The Inquiry, would provide food for thought in this connection.

of strengthening the church as an institution. What concrete purposes and objectives has this church outside its own self-perpetuation if the truth is actually faced?

Of course the basic motives of the church in building its program should be faced and formulated by the whole congregation so far as possible. It is likely that the official leadership may have to go a long way in this before the congregation at large gives serious thought to it. It is quite possible that educationally minded persons in the Church School Council or in the teaching staff may have to lead the official body in such a study. It is certain that the pastor and director, if there be such, will be the ones to stimulate, initiate, guide, and prosecute this study on the part of the lay leadership and the congregation. It will require sermons, workers' conferences, midweek meeting discussion groups, Church School adult class studies, and many private conferences to carry it through. But the new self-consciousness of concrete purpose and expected outcomes will be worth all the cost. Such a study of basic purpose is the first step in any church toward the new conception of itself as a school in Christian living. Until this study is carried through, the work of a professional religious educator will be restricted largely to fringe activities and partial resources.

After the objectives of the church as a school in Christian living have been clearly and concretely defined, the program providing the necessary experiences in Christian living must be formulated and set up. In so far as possible this will mean the putting of new purpose, clearer insight, and more accurate guidance into program elements already available. Change will be as slight as possible and as gradual as possible consistent with the clearly perceived purposes. Continuity, rather than a sharp break with the past, will be the policy.

Christian living can be learned only by guided practice in Christian living. The traditional church and Sunday School programs have provided a maximum of guidance and a minimum of practice. But guidance which does not actually carry over into practice is not even guidance. The traditional church or school of the better type, which deals much, by sermon and prayer, lesson and lecture, precept and example, with living the Christian life might quite accurately be described as a school *about* Christian living. It is some gain to have gone that far. However, while a program *about* life may be life-centered in content, certainly it is not life-centered in method. The basic method of the church as a school in Christian living will be to bring enough of the activities and experiences of the students under the control and influence of

Christian leadership in a thoroughly Christian social environment to give them an actual taste of Kingdom of God living.

Perhaps a word of caution—or of assurance, as the case may be—is due here. When we have carefully defined the purposes or objectives of the church as a school in Christian living; when we have developed a program to provide the necessary experiences; when we have adjusted our method to provide for first-hand experiencing of Christian living rather than mere talk about it; with all this modern educational set-up, are we proposing to "educate our students into the Kingdom of God"? Have we become so erudite and self-sufficient that we can get along now without those divine forces which the evangelist and teacher have always assumed as the chief factor at work in the human soul?

If the person who raises that question insists upon his own narrow definition of education as mere human instruction, we answer a most emphatic "No!" We have no expectation of adequate changes in human life coming about by that limited process. If, however, he will accept the broader definition of education as consisting of all those forces, human and divine, by which desirable changes are wrought in human lives and personalities, we say: "Yes! That is precisely what we

propose to do." For the first and greatest of all teachers of the Christian way is still the Master Teacher in our own classroom, or workshop, or playground. Were it not for his coöperation it would be sheer folly for us with our poor abilities and materials to set our aims so high. Both Scripture and experience justify us in counting just as certainly upon these divine forces when the church is a school in Christian living as when it is a gospel station proclaiming salvation to a lost and sinful world.

When the church becomes conscious of itself as a school in Christian living it will depend upon the resources of this educational method in its broad, vital, and spiritual sense to fulfill its purposes. The educational function, causing the continuous spiritual growth of its entire constituency, of all ages, will enlist and employ the total personnel and resources of the church. Every element of the program, whether lesson, sermon, business meeting, social, picnic, or quilting bee, will be judged by its bearing upon this growth in Christlikeness on the part of all those affected by it.

But such an educational program will have as its purpose and outcome not only the development of Christlike personalities on the part of individuals. It will also set up a social group in which the Kingdom of God is being demonstrated as a

social pattern. It will go farther, becoming creative with reference to the Church and Christianity itself.

Dr. Coe[1] reminds us that, in the actual process of teaching, Christianity undergoes inevitable changes wrought upon it by the person and experience of the teacher. Certainly those who enter deeply into Christian experience leave the sum total of the Christian religion more or less changed as a result. Without a Paul, an Augustine, a Luther, a Calvin, or a Wesley, how different Christianity might have been! Phillips Brooks, David Livingstone, and Walter Rauschenbusch, have left a different Christianity from that which they found. So the church which undertakes to make of itself a school in Christian living will enter a creative rôle. The educational process will not now be a means of preserving the church of the past. It will not devote itself to perpetuating the errors and prejudices of an older generation. Rather, it will set itself the task of transcending past experience, of rejuvenating the church, and of creating a newer and higher type of Christian living.

Such a reconstruction or reinterpretation of the purposes, program, and method of the church as we have proposed as the goal of the Christian edu-

[1]Coe, George Albert, "What Is Christian Education?" page 23. Scribners, 1929.

cator necessarily involves organizational changes. These organizational adjustments are made more easily than any of the others. It is perhaps for that reason that so many churches, after hearing of the values of a real educational program, make organizational provisions looking toward such a program and there the matter stops. It is doubtful whether the form of a desirable organizational and administrative provision for religious education should be made so readily as it usually is. There ought to be some way to get the whole congregation, and particularly the officiary, to struggle with the issues involved before conveniently burying them or sidetracking them in a committee or council. To do violence to a worthy figure, it may be better to let the new wine of the educational ideal burst the old organizational wine skins and show their inadequacy than to provide new wine skins to remain empty, as is so often done.

Until the church as such recognizes its own fundamental educational nature and faces responsibility for efficient educational administration through its officiary, there is little likelihood that the religious educator can go far toward its reconstruction as a school in Christian living. Organizational changes ought not to be considered prerequisite to the processes we have been describing but rather an outcome. At least some vital

changes ought to precede organizational adjustments.

A bulletin on "The Church Council of Religious Education," published by the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, makes this significant statement:

> The responsibility for the Christian education of its constituency is the responsibility of the *whole church,* rather than that of the Sunday School and other subordinate organizations. . . . The educational program of the local church can achieve its maximum fruitfulness only when the church itself gives its support to that program and provides adequate and efficient supervision for it.
>
> Whenever a Presbyterian church really becomes convinced that Christian education should be for it a major function, it will realize the need for placing the overhead responsibility for that function upon a body that officially represents the entire congregation. The great underlying need in Christian education is to lift this work to a place of greater importance in the thinking of the church members as a body.
>
> Our General Assembly has made it clear in several deliverances that responsibility for the entire educational program of the individual church rests upon *the session* and must, by the session, be either discharged or delegated. The statement of the General Assembly of 1911 is, in part, as follows:
>
> "This business of supervision belongs to the pastor and session. Where the session is willing and able to give to this work the time and attention it

must have, it may be willing to attend to it, rather than to entrust it to another body, but no session should feel justified in refusing to do both, for it ought either to do the work itself or to commit it to some one else."

As a part, therefore, of the total process of transforming the church into a school in Christian living will come those organizational provisions necessary to give responsible administration and supervision on the part of the church to its educational function. Ideally this should be the central concern of the church officiary or session itself. Usually, however, because these persons were chosen for quite other functions and without regard for their qualifications as educational leaders, and also because the traditional functions would be hard to change, it will be found expedient to set up an educational administrative overhead distinctive from, although related to, the regular officiary.

There is some difference of opinion among religious educators as to the character of this administering board or council. Should it be composed of persons selected because they represent the church as a whole and will presumably view the educational work in a broad, unbiased manner by reason of being not too closely involved in it? Or should its membership be made up of representatives of the various departments and phases of work,

persons actively engaged in the program and so closely in touch with it?

The administrative theory of public education and of most big industrial and financial organizations is cited in favor of the board composed for the most part of persons not necessarily actively engaged with specific responsibilities in the Church School staff. The public-school board, for example, is composed, not of educators but of representative men of the community who can view public-school problems in an unbiased and judicial manner. If they desire technical knowledge or expert advice on educational matters they ask the superintendent and his staff to supply it. They do not initiate but act as a reviewing body passing upon the recommendations and policies submitted by the superintendent. A proposal to select the school board from among the superintendent and his principals and teachers would meet with opposition if indeed not with derision.

The typical corporation is actually controlled by a board of directors who may have little technical knowledge about the operation of the enterprise. They do, however, on the basis of information and recommendations supplied by the employed executive staff, make the decisions and determine the policies of the corporation. It is maintained that a representative group of church men could do

likewise for the Church School even though not actively engaged in its leadership. The difficulty in having the board of religious education composed of representatives of the various aspects of work in which they are engaged is that each person sees his own job and his own interests in the largest terms and will face all decisions and policies from the single standpoint of their bearing on his own work or organization. Hence, instead of being a body that represents the general interests of the church, it is a board made up of special pleaders for this cause and that cause, none of them quite able to see the whole task.

Because of the similarity of this plan to that of the board of education in public schools, or the board of directors in corporations, we may call it "the board plan."

Theoretically the case for such a general representative board seems sound. Practically it will be found that in most churches those persons sufficiently interested in the educational work of the church to give the necessary time and study to the work of such a board are already actively engaged on the staff of the Church School. If they are not, likely they should be. While some values would be found in the disinterested viewpoint and judgment of one not occupied with the actual work of the Church School, the danger is that such a

person would be literally disinterested to the point of making no contribution whatever. His chief influence would be in the form of inertia. It is true that there is a slight chance of developing interest by putting him on the board, but that is not quite the purpose for which this body is set up. It is to administer an educational program for the sake of the church constituency at large, not for the development of its own members.

The other general viewpoint is that the administrative body should be composed chiefly of those actively engaged in the work and directly responsible for its ongoing. They are the persons sufficiently interested to give of their time and their energy to the Church School. This is a token of the reliable service which they will render on such an administrative body. They are already interested in the work and they have the information needed for the formulation of policies and the direction of activities. As they are the persons responsible for the execution of policies, there will be a direct and immediate channeling down from the administrative body to the actual learning-teaching situation where these policies go into effect.

Furthermore there is some question about the fairness of placing in final authority over these voluntary workers, who are giving of their best to the work, a group of officials, who are likely to

give much less of time and thought. The right of control ought to rest more largely with those who make the larger sacrifices.

In many cases also the chief influence of such a board, if it functions at all, will be inhibitive. The workers will not only have their work to do but they will have the even more difficult task of carrying this governing body along with them in order to be assured of permission to make the changes demanded by the developing program. If the administrative body takes its responsibility seriously and actually assumes control of the program it will itself constitute as much of an educational problem as any confronted by the staff, and so will increase their task without helping to carry it. If it does not take itself seriously and assume control, why have it? There is already too much idle machinery in the church organization.

It is true that a council made up of the representatives of various agencies, departments, and phases of the work would be inclined to develop varying viewpoints as to where emphasis should be placed. It is likely that some members will be thinking chiefly of securing advantages for the functions or agencies which they represent. However, with the general officers which should also be on the council, it is likely that a fair proportion of emphasis will be maintained.

Because such a body is made up of representatives of varying interests and responsibilities, coming together for a pooling of these interests, this type of administrative overhead may well be called "the council plan."

Whether the board plan or the council plan is followed, certain principles apply to both. The board or council should represent the church as such and should be appointed or elected in a manner similar to that used in the case of the other church officiary. There are several satisfactory plans. One is to have members nominated by the officiary or session of the church and elected by the congregation, the members being chosen from the church at large, not simply from the session. Another plan is to have the members elected in whatever manner has been adopted for the church officiary. Still another is to have a Nominating Committee, whose report is ratified by congregational action. In the case of the council the personnel will largely be determined by the composition of the Church School staff, since it is representative of various departments. Each agency or department may elect its own representative, or the representation may be ex officio, the council being made up of all department heads. If the council in turn makes appointments to the staff, this latter plan makes it virtually a close corporation. Probably

the church officiary or congregation should retain power of ratification. Each denomination is apt to have its own procedure. In the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., for instance, the session has the entire responsibility for setting up the organization.

The plan, frequently followed, of having the administrative body a subcommittee of the officiary or session is not quite satisfactory. While it unifies control, it restricts the personnel to church officials who may not comprise the best available persons. Futhermore education is more fundamental and all-pervasive than the functions carried by other subcommittees. In fact it is the basic method of approaching most of these other functions. Its administration should receive more recognition than a subcommittee would give it.

The board or council should be sufficiently limited in size to make regular meetings with full attendance possible, and to carry on most of the discussions and actions as a "committee of the whole." No arbitrary maximum number can be set though efficiency rapidly decreases as the number of such a group goes beyond seven or nine. To make it representative of varied interests, however, a considerably larger number may sometimes be necessary. The setting up of this board or council will be far more effective if it is undertaken as an

educational project to be developed than if blueprint specifications are found in some book and followed. As the functions of such a board become clear, the persons best qualified and situated to carry these should be selected, and the whole setup should be kept somewhat flexible and growing. As a matter of fact, when the development of this administrative overhead body is faced in this way, as in itself an educational project, it will likely be found that a combination of the board plan and the council plan will result. There will be a nucleus of general church representatives, with department heads completing the personnel.

With the church recognizing its own fundamentally educational character by thus intrusting to a representative body the development of a program which will use the educational method throughout, the director is in a position to undertake a very promising enterprise of spiritual engineering. He will be the organizer and promoter of the educational program and ideal, the executive officer of the board or council, and the supervisor of the staff and the whole educational program. The church itself, under the leadership of his colleagues and himself, will become a school in Christian living.

CHAPTER IV

The Director as Organizer

WHETHER the board plan or the council plan of overhead administrative body is followed, some one person will be the initiator and educational prophet in all its creative work. For its first function is creative—that of planning and developing that whole new type of church program which will transform the church itself into a school in Christian living. In cases where there is a director of religious education this is his first function —the organization and projection of an adequate program of religious education for the whole church constituency. This will consist, not of launching something entirely new, but of gradually reconstructing existing program elements according to this new conception of the church as an educational institution. It is impossible, therefore, to separate the functions of the director from those of the board or council in behalf of whose purposes and policies he carries on his work. With a clear understanding of the relationship between the director and this governing body, a presentation of the

functions of the one will make clear the functions of the other.

The relationships between a board of control and its executive officer and staff form an interesting study, sometimes involving apparent paradoxes. The aggressiveness and success of a given corporation or business enterprise is usually determined by the qualities of its active executive staff. A change in the personnel of this staff or its ranking officer is usually more likely to effect a change in the policies of the organization than would a similar change in the board of control. This is true in spite of the fact that the board employs the executive and has final authority regarding his policies. For example, an exceedingly progressive public-school system is usually far more an outcome of the leadership of a strong and progressive superintendent of education than of any particular type of personnel on the school board.

The closest analogy to the director and his board in this regard is, of course, that of the pastor and the church officiary. An aggressive, expanding church program with increasing membership strength is far more dependent upon the minister than upon the official board, even though they do have the power to employ or retire him and to approve or veto his policies. This does not mean that the personnel of the board is a matter of

indifference. It does mean that when that board has chosen the right leader, it has exerted its most potent function and is henceforth largely conditioned in its activities by his leadership. Instead of being a mere means by which the board carries out its policies, he becomes a powerful factor in determining those policies. He may in time have much to do with the type of personnel on the board. The relationship is one of the closest reciprocity.

This close interdependence is particularly true in the case of an enterprise which is as new and as rapidly changing as the modern program of Christian education. Here, far more than in programs or procedures which are well established by long practice, there is a complete interdependence between board or council and chief of staff. The board is more dependent on his leadership because of lack of general familiarity with the best practice and lack of very reliable popular criteria for evaluation. He is likely, therefore, to be able to exert a very strong influence in any direction he may choose as he interprets the program to the board members and counsels them with reference to policies.

There is a sense also in which the executive leader is much more dependent on his board in a new and developing enterprise than in one which is better established. In so far as his policies represent

radical departures from custom he will have to secure strong backing for putting them over with the constituency. He will find it necessary to have his board not only acquiescent but aggressively supporting him in order to carry through. The relationship, therefore, paradoxical as it seems, is one in which the controlling board is actually controlled by the executive in so far as he can convince them of the soundness of his policies.

The director should be called in the same manner as a pastor is called. If there is already a Church School board or council it will likely take the initiative in his nomination. If there is not, the church officiary or session will do so, the appointment being ratified preferably by congregational action. When the director arrives on the job he surveys the general situation and begins to recommend the needed policies and changes. These become effective only by action of the board or council and should be limited to those items which he is quite sure will be approved. Items on which he is doubtful or may expect decided opposition must be held in abeyance, either until evidence accumulates which will give them a stronger chance, or until by personal conference and patient explanation and demonstration he has been able to win over the objectors. The board in turn must not be led to proceed so rapidly as to lose the whole-

hearted support of the wider constituency. This delicate job of getting others to share his educational ideals and policies is the director's first concern.

His first major objective will be to develop the new conception of the church as a school in Christian living in the minds of his board or council, his staff, and the whole church. The method of beginning this will be through such a study of the basic purposes of the church as has already been suggested.

When such a study is made it will be found that many of the traditional formulas will hardly bear close analysis, or will be ambiguous or void of any definite meaning whatever. "To save souls," "to evangelize the world," "to bring in the Kingdom of God," "to teach God's Word," "to Christianize society," and "to make people Christian" are typical statements of the purpose of the church. None of them have much concrete meaning apart from more detailed interpretation. All of them involve bringing about desirable changes in persons. Even a better society can be achieved only through improvement in individuals. A new type of humanity is the only means of achieving a new type of society. This was clearly the conviction of Jesus himself.

If now we list the objectives of Christian

religious education as interpreted by more than forty Protestant Communions through the International Council of Religious Education, it is at once apparent that these are but concrete interpretations of what the Church has always conceived to be her purpose and task:

I. Religious education seeks to foster in growing persons a consciousness of God as a reality in human experience, and a sense of personal relationship to him.

II. Religious education seeks to develop in growing persons such an understanding and appreciation of the personality, life, and teachings of Jesus as will lead to discovery of him as Saviour and Lord, loyalty to him and his cause, and manifest itself in daily life and conduct.

III. Religious education seeks to foster in growing persons a progressive and continuous development of Christlike character.

IV. Religious education seeks to develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to participate in and contribute constructively to the building of a social order embodying the ideal of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

V. Religious education seeks to develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to participate in the organized society of Christians—the Church.

VI. Religious education seeks to lead growing persons into a Christian interpretation of life and the universe; the ability to see in it God's

purpose and plan; a life philosophy built on this interpretation.

VII. Religious education seeks to effect in growing persons the assimilation of the best religious experience of the race, as effective guidance to present experience.[1]

If the above statements provide a satisfactory formulation not only of the objectives of Christian religious education but of the purpose of the total Church, it is apparent that they call for the conception of the Church as itself a school in Christian living. "Educational" aims cannot be selected as something apart from or even as but a part of the total purpose of the Church. They constitute that purpose.

Such general statements as the above are satisfactory as an interpretation of the Church's total task. They need next to be translated into still more detailed objectives for various age groups and social groups, and to be laid out in terms of specific undertakings during longer and shorter periods of time. In other words they should be translated finally into policies, goals, and programs.

The formulation of policies is one of the most important functions in which the director, the

[1] Quoted by permission of the International Council of Religious Education.

pastor, and the board or council of religious education coöperate. Since policies are an expression of educational viewpoint, the director makes one of his largest contributions as a technician in connection with their formulation.

Certain policies are of an administrative nature. Shall the sexes be kept separate in much of the program or shall the sex factor largely be ignored as a basis in grouping? Shall classification be based upon chronological age, public-school grade, social grouping, achievement in Church School work, or upon the desires of the student? Shall grouping follow the yearly grades of the public schools, or shall two or more public-school grades be combined? Shall a wider age range be used for certain activities, such as worship, than for others, such as study or discussion? Shall students be dropped from the roll after a certain number of absences? What kind of follow-up will be used for absentees? Shall emphasis be given to the Church School as an institution, or shall the complete identification of church and school be sought? Shall attendance be encouraged through contests, prizes, or loyalty campaigns, or shall dependence be placed upon the quality of the program and the personal contacts of leaders with students? Shall small classes of eight or ten be the rule or shall the larger groups of twenty to

forty as in the public school be the administrative unit for teaching and activity? Where shall final authority be vested in settling specific administrative problems, such as a problem of classifying a given student who seems dissatisfied?

Closely related are policies as to leadership. Shall certain well defined standards of qualification be the basis for selecting or continuing leaders, or shall any consecrated person who is willing to serve be used? Shall there be definite requirements in performance, such as regular and dependable service and careful preparation of the current teaching plans? Shall teachers be remunerated for their services? Shall expenses of their training be carried by the church? Shall persons not members of the Church be used as teachers? Shall teachers be responsible to the director himself or to department supervisors or principals? Shall an effort be made to provide boys with men teachers and girls with women teachers, or shall sex be disregarded? Shall a teacher keep the same class more than a year? Are teachers or principals responsible for following up absentees? Are teachers looked upon as real officers of the church?

Then there are financial policies. Shall the school be self-supporting or shall it be cared for in the regular church budget? Shall separate

treasuries for church and school be kept? [1] Shall separate class treasuries be permitted? Shall "special day" offerings be taken? Shall pledges be taken? Shall weekly offering envelopes be used? Shall there be a budget for the year or shall money be "raised" as needed?

It is apparent that all the above policies rest upon certain underlying educational policies. Is Christian religious education interpreted as instruction and indoctrination or is it conceived as sharing in the life of a Christian social group? Is efficient teaching judged in terms of teacher activity or in terms of pupil activity? How shall the problem of discipline be faced? Shall the formal schoolroom atmosphere prevail or shall a free and informal group life be the pattern of the class? Shall pupils be instructed or shall they be set to investigating? Shall the curricular materials be chiefly Biblical or shall a wide range of materials be used? Shall graded lessons be used? Shall electives be used? If so, in what grades or groups will they be introduced? Who shall select lesson courses? Shall teachers be permitted to

[1] The author was once asked to counsel the leaders of a great city Church School. The first problem brought up was that of finance. Closely related was that of the apparent selfishness and lack of church loyalty of many strong class groups. On investigation it was discovered that there were twenty-six different treasuries in the church—and an audit could be secured of less than half of them!

follow their own desires as to lesson courses to be used? Shall worship be central or somewhat subordinate in the curriculum? What place shall memory work have? What provisions shall be made for testing the results of the Church School work?

Every question in the above groups involves basic educational philosophy and policy. If these questions are settled by past practice, by prejudice, or by following the lines of least resistance, it is certain that sound principles of personality development will be violated thereby. It is in determining such policies as these that the church needs the counsel and leadership of an expert.

It is unlikely that a church board or a Church School council would call a plumber to repair a water pipe or install a drinking fountain and then insist that he use only the tools and methods of a novice. Nor is it likely they would call in a decorator or a piano tuner and then dispute his opinion regarding the proper procedures and the desirable results. It is not at all unusual, however, to have the sound counsel of the specialist in religious education laughed out of court or quite ignored by those who are totally ignorant of educational psychology and the laws of learning. The religious educational technician has a task as complex and exacting as that of any other specialist, and yet

on every hand he meets those who feel quite certain that they understand it as well as he does and that any differences of opinion are due to his impractical theories. In formulating policies and getting them intelligently adopted by his board, the director has one of his most trying educational tasks. But success in it is well worth all the patience which it is sure to cost.

Policies are made concrete through the setting of definite goals. The higher goals approaching the ideal should be set well in the future. A board or council can be led to adopt almost any reasonable goal if sufficient time intervenes for its realization.

For example, if traditional practice has long separated the sexes from the Primary age up and the sound policy adopted is to create normal social groupings by making sex a very secondary factor, it would be sheer folly to put this in practice all at once. Introduce it in the Primary Department. Let the others remain separated but in promoting Primary classes into the Junior Department keep them mixed. In three years the Junior Department will consist of mixed classes throughout. Each three years the new policy will come into force in another department. Time will bring the policy into universal operation.

Or suppose it be the policy of a leaders' stand-

ard of qualifications. It may be the goal to have every teacher a Standard Leadership graduate. Obviously, it would be folly to put it into effect at once. Instead, two Standard credits per year could be required with the understanding that no new teacher would be added to the staff who would not undertake to meet this requirement provided the church supplied the opportunity. In six or seven years the goal would be realized in large measure and no one would have been crowded off or unreasonably burdened.

The policy of remunerating teachers would far better be gradually approached by the church's assuming all expenses of training than by being suddenly adopted. A unified budget adopted at once might actually impoverish the educational work, whereas ultimately it must be looked upon as the only adequate provision.

Suppose the policy be one requiring a new building or certain improved equipment. If the goal be set far enough in the future, the most reluctant board or council may wax enthusiastic over it. Because the educational method is gradual and patient, the educational director must himself be disciplined to wait. This should, however, be active and aggressive waiting, not mere resignation and acquiescence. Sometimes there are many different ways to approach the same goal. The

director can afford to use several. The necessity of the time element in the director's program makes the usual short tenure of office of the director little short of suicidal to his educational ideals. They are cut off long before their time. The director should work on the basis of a minimum time unit of ten years. That is, goals worthy of his profession ought to be set so high that ten years of steady endeavor and progress would be required to reach them.

But it is not enough to dream of accomplishments ten years hence. The intervening time should be broken up into units—five years, three years, one year—the total gains of the ten-year period being distributed year by year. These shorter periods should be defined in terms of very concrete achievements. Each period may have its major emphasis. The first year may be given largely to clarifying objectives, getting workers' conferences under way, and strengthening the forces and organization. A standard might be adopted as the means of doing this. The second year might stress the recruiting and training of leadership; the third year, the expanding of the program to provide more time and a richer curriculum. The fourth year may be given to recruiting new students and building up regularity of attendance. Seven years hence a new building may

be in the schedule. And so it goes. Goals of staggering dimensions, if properly distributed, may appear quite within reason. The laying out of these policies and goals will be the director's prophetic, creative, and organizing function.

How far he will take his board or council into his confidence in his long-term goals will be determined largely by the circumstances and personnel. Usually his own vision will reach somewhat farther than he would dare expect his colleagues to see. Cubberley [1] uses the lucid figure of stairs in discussing this same relationship between the goals of the public-school superintendent and those which he is able to share with his school board. The ten years may be represented by ten steps. The director has his eye on the tenth, at the top, and sees all the others intervening and knows just what upward gains each one represents. If he were to reveal to his board what he sees as the tenth step, they might lose all confidence in his judgment and forthwith cease to follow him. They might even discharge him and get some one who was less of a dreamer. But they are able to see the third, and perhaps even as far as the fifth, and as their own conception of the educational task becomes more adequate he shares with them his own.

[1] Cubberley, Ellwood Patterson, "Public School Administration." page 146, Houghton Mifflin, 1922.

Thus, while the director may be sure of his tenure of office only from year to year, he can render his prophetic service as an organizer of the program only by assuming that he is to go on for a lifetime. When his vision ceases to outreach that of his board or council his prophetic rôle is ended.

One of the best ways to organize such policies and goals is to use a standard such as the International Standard in Religious Education. Of the many items in such a Standard those should be chosen for concentrated effort from year to year which are most basic with respect to meeting the particular needs of the situation, and most likely to prescribe improvements within the range of possibility. An attempt to give equal emphasis to all items at the same time is discouraging to lay workers who have yet to develop adequate appreciation of the program as a whole, and who are confused by attempting many different changes at once. Over a six-year or ten-year period general improvement can be secured by successive emphasis on different aspects with the determination always to conserve all gains made.

As the foregoing procedure of launching policies and setting goals for longer and shorter periods gets under way, the program will gradually undergo reconstruction in the direction of these goals and in accordance with the accepted policies.

It is much better to keep the emphasis on program improvement rather than on organizational changes and realignments. The latter, however, are certain to come ultimately.

The more immediate organizational goal will be to unify and organize all the educational work affiliated with the church into one comprehensive program carried by an agency to be called the Church School. Each age group should be provided with a program sufficiently rich and inclusive to supply opportunity and incentive for all those experiences necessary in learning to live the Christian life. This will mean that not only the traditional Sunday School, but Young People's Societies, mission bands, women's organizations, brotherhoods, Scout troops, and Vacation Church Schools come ultimately under the direction of the Church School council or board and accept the educational counsel of the director. Week-day religious education, if of the local church type, will of course be included; if it is of the interdenominational type, the director and Church School council will share in its direction through an interchurch or community board of religious education. They will seek still to keep the experiences provided by this fruitful agency an integral part of the total experience of the student in learning to live the Christian life.

The Church School so expanded and so unified will be all that the name implies, the school of the church, to which is assigned the educational work of the church for all age groups. The consummation of such a comprehensive and unified organization of this educational work, even after the policies calling for it are adopted, may well be a three-year or five-year goal, depending upon the strength of traditional prejudices and agency loyalties. As the educational method becomes increasingly creative and democratic, this ideal of the Church School will likely emerge in the actual processes of group life. Artificial crowding or speeding up of the process is likely to endanger it and produce most undesirable reactions.

Beyond the goal of the Church School as the comprehensive agency of Christian education in the local church lies a still more distant goal—that of the church itself as a school in Christian living. While the director is holding before his board the ideal of the Church School as the fifth or sixth step upward toward efficient organization, his own vision will rest yonder on the tenth or twelfth step—that of the church itself as a discipleship.

Organizationally this means what is sometimes called the "graded church," though the ideal goes much farther than mere age grouping or grading.

In fact, the term is somewhat objectionable since it implies too much stress on age divisions and not enough on the identity of the individual of whatever age with the total fellowship. The "educational church," or "the church as a school," while more awkward expressions, are truer to the ideal. On the whole it will probably be best to keep the good word "church," eliminate all competing agency names, and put new meaning into this one name, which has a heritage worth preserving even while our own day enriches its full meaning.

The church itself thus organized as a school in Christian living will provide for each individual experiences of social participation in groups of varying range. Most of these experiences will be with others of his own age since the most effective program elements will be graded to meet the various levels of experience. This will call for the setting up of various departments on the age-group basis. The total organization, therefore, will consist of the church nursery, the church kindergarten, the Primary Department of the church, the Junior Department of the church, and so on. The majority of program elements will be carried on through these departments.

Essential to the full experience of church relationships, however, are contacts with the church as a whole. Certain programs, such as a general

church picnic, a simple worship service in which all participate, a special program at Christmas time, and so on, will provide each person with opportunity for conscious fellowship with all the others. The pattern of the family serves better than that of the school to interpret the meaning and value of this wider fellowship. Consciousness of identity with the church itself, and not simply with one department of it, will grow only out of such opportunities for wider fellowship and participation. It is in its failure to recognize this need that the so-called "graded church" carries a sound principle too far. Gradation must always be limited by the need for the wider fellowship.

In this whole development the true educator will never forget that organization itself is a highly educative process. In fact, if curriculum is conceived in the broad sense as consisting of all those experiences which are made use of in achieving individual Christlikeness and a Christian social group, it is apparent that organization itself is a definite part of the curriculum. For a Junior Department to carry through successfully a party for the entertainment of their parents, or a Christmas program, or an enterprise of service in which they share with those less fortunate, may be of great educational value. The formation of committees which assume definite responsibility, the coöperation of the va-

rious groups to make a success of the whole, and the practice in leadership as well as "followship" throughout the enterprise are among the highest of these educational values, provided they make proper place for initiative, for constructive guidance, and for conscious self-criticism.

The educational value in the organizing process depends far less upon the actual form of organization which results than it does upon the method used in achieving it. A democratic procedure which grows from step to step through guided initiative and self-criticized practice may move slowly toward the desired goal, and may encounter many digressions. But it is educationally far more valuable than an organizing process which slavishly follows a blue print under the domination of a leader determined to drive steadily forward toward his ideal.

The "perfect" organization can never be achieved educationally; if it should be, at that very moment, growth, self-criticism, and striving would cease. The church so perfectly organized that no changes are needed has made itself a victim of the blue print rather than made the pattern an instrument of continuous growth.

Any organization change which does not come whole-heartedly and democratically probably comes too soon. Vitality and initiative are crushed

out. The leader has given place to the demagogue, the teacher to the master. Looking upon the improvement of organization as itself part of the curriculum, the director will throw himself into those creative educational processes through which gradually his own ideals will be shared by others, and they will move forward intelligently and spontaneously into better types of group organization and activity. Whether he thinks of himself as organizer, executive, or supervisor, the director is first, last, and always a teacher.

However excellent may be the policies laid out by the director and his board or council, however thorough may be the development of the program, however sound the plan of organization, the scope and effectiveness of the whole enterprise will be largely conditioned by the degree to which the church constituency as a whole can be brought to share intelligently in its purposes and ideals. The director's first concern is to get his pastor and his board or council to share his own ideals and purposes, and then to back him in bringing the whole constituency of the church to a similar viewpoint and appreciation of the educational method in the church.

CHAPTER V

The Director as Executive

THE DIRECTOR discharges only the first of his functions when he acts as initiator of policies and programs upon which he seeks the approval of the Church School council or board of religious education. When those policies and plans have received the approval of this body, he becomes its executive officer for the carrying out of the proposed program. The board should be organized with a chairman other than the director for he acts rather as an executive secretary. The board, however, holds him responsible for the execution of its actions.

In view of the fact that the director is its executive officer for the carrying out of policies, and its expert adviser for the supplying of factual data, for interpretation of educational practices and policies, and for counsel in matters involving educational principles and procedures, the question arises as to whether the board or council should set up subcommittees for special functions. The danger in such subcommittees is that their functions are very

likely to encroach upon the executive function and to hamper or duplicate the director's own activities. Of course, to prevent such cross purposes, he might be considered an ex officio member of all committees. It is probable even then that efficiency in the executive function is more likely to be hindered than helped through the complicated machinery of a committee system. Items not of sufficient importance to receive the attention of the whole board or council should be left in the hands of the director. Items so important that they demand group judgment should be brought before the whole body. Subcommittee work also is almost certain to detract from the functioning of the whole group and defeat the unifying influence which the body should exert.

As a part of his function both as an organizer and as an executive, the director is the channel through which requests and suggestions from individuals or groups come before the council or board. Such an item would usually be reported by him together with all needed or pertinent factual data and with his own recommendation as to appropriate action. Decisions reached and whatever action might be needed to put them into effect would be reported through and carried out by the director. Perhaps illustrations will clarify these procedures.

A movement to set up a coöperative leadership training school is launched in the city. Those interested in it bring the matter to the attention of the director. He investigates fully in order to get the necessary data upon which to base an intelligent recommendation to his board or council. This will include the following items: auspices under which school will be held; standards of work to be maintained; qualifications and personnel of instructors to be used; courses to be offered; cost and basis of sharing this; location and schedule of school; its relation to past and future training enterprises; probable enrollment of his own Church School leaders, present and prospective. These data will be available for the board and will be accompanied by a recommendation to participate or not to participate, with reasons therefor.

The recommendation to participate might also carry the further recommendation that students from this church have their registration fee paid and their books furnished at the expense of the church. It might carry other recommendations affecting the control, standards, and staff of the school as conditions upon which participation could be recommended.

When the board or council has acted upon these recommendations, either as submitted or as amended, the director then becomes responsible for

making the proper negotiations to effect participation, for securing enrollments, and for other actions authorized.

Or suppose the Senior Department leaders wish to offer an elective course in leadership training, in vocational guidance, or in peace education, along with the regular Senior curriculum which has already been authorized. The director investigates the courses available, the qualified leadership to be used, the conditions as to standards and credits if any, and the schedule of the proposed class. He also finds out the probable number of students who could and should be enrolled in such a course. He brings these data to the board or council, with his own recommendation regarding the proposed enterprise. The board takes action, and he sees to it that the action is carried out.

An item affecting the whole school would be the annual budget. In conference with the responsible leaders in each department, the director finds out what the budget needs are for the coming year. He compiles all these items and adds such general items as office accessories and upkeep, salaries, and library upkeep. This makes the total Church School budget. If the aggregate is more than he dares to bring before the board, he may reduce it at points where in his judgment it will cause the least sacrifice of program. He presents his budget

to the council or board. They go over it item by item and finally approve it, with revisions if necessary. The director reports this authorized budget back to department heads and advises with them concerning its wise expenditure. A general purchasing agent may assist the director but in any case purchase requisitions should be made on a regular form and should have the director's signature.

Of course the whole financial system in many Church Schools will be but a branch of the church system. In cases where it would mean more rather than less adequate support for religious education the Church School budget should be a part of the total church budget. This does not affect the above procedure except that the action of the board or council of religious education would need to be approved by the governing body of the church.

The director initiates and executes while the board or council acts as a reviewing and authorizing body. This relationship is made still clearer in the case of the appointment or transfer of staff members. The director is the ranking officer in the Church School staff. All others are responsible to him and he in turn is responsible to the Church School council or board. After this body has called him with the approval of the church, he becomes responsible for building up and maintaining the staff.

This means that he recommends all appointments or changes to the board. If a vacancy occurs he finds the best available person to fill it and nominates this person to the board. If the board is unable to approve this nomination it does not make a substitute nomination but rather asks him to find a more satisfactory nominee. Thus no person is appointed to the staff except by his nomination, yet he has the backing of his board in every appointment. If after observation, investigation, and conference with those directly concerned as department heads, he believes that a given leader should be transferred from one department to another he so recommends, with reasons therefor. In those trying situations where a leader must be dropped from the staff it is the action of the board or council rather than his own as an individual which authorizes it. Thus he is protected both from unjust criticism and from prejudiced or hasty action.

If the above plan seems to place much power in the hands of the director it must be insisted that with less influence than this in determining the personnel of his staff, he can hardly be expected to carry that degree of responsibility for developing and maintaining a staff which he properly bears. The relationship is that prevailing in most organizations involving an executive and members of a staff.

It must be admitted that this responsibility for the staff personnel, with final approval in the hands of the board or council, gives rise to a rather delicate situation in cases where the council is composed of staff members entirely. Particularly is this true when the council personnel is made up of an ex officio membership; that is, when they receive places on the council by reason of the Church School offices which they hold. For this reason it is well to have the nucleus of the council composed of members elected to the council regardless of Church School office.

As ranking officer of the staff, the director presides over general staff or faculty meetings. He takes primary responsibility for planning them since they form a part of his general supervisory program, as we shall see in Chapter VI.

In cases of uncertainty or disagreement as to the application of a given policy or in problems not covered by a defined policy, or in emergency situations, the director carries responsibility for decision as to procedure. For example, if a new student enrolls about whose classification there is doubt due to unusual factors, the director decides what the classification will be. If a student seems unhappy or out of adjustment when classified according to established policies, the director determines what can be done to correct the difficulty. If a

change in lesson courses or schedule or program in a given group is proposed the director approves it or vetoes it if it is not of sufficient moment to bring before the council.

General department officers, such as principals or supervisors, are responsible to the director. Teachers in departments are also responsible to him through their own department officers. The school when in session is headed by the director, though he may delegate much administrative responsibility to general and department officers. In fact, if he is to carry out his all-important supervisory function as discussed in the next chapter, he will find it necessary to place large administrative responsibility on other shoulders.

This brings up the interesting question as to the place of the general superintendent, if any, in the Church School which employs a director. This question can be discussed intelligently only in the light of the scope of the director's executive and supervisory functions. Some so-called directors are merely employed Sunday School superintendents, and of course render quite nonessential an additional voluntary superintendent. Other directors have functions of so much wider scope and so different in character that the general superintendent is affected only by being given the assistance which comes from genuine educational

supervision. It is necessary, therefore, to face the question as to the scope of the director's functions and responsibilities.

As the church comes to conceive of itself as a school in Christian living it will increasingly demand that all agencies and programs under its auspices contribute efficiently to this educational purpose. It will count as wasteful and unwarranted any expenditure of energy, time, or funds which does not have educational value. One of its chief purposes in calling an educational director is to bring all these agencies and fragmentary programs under a common supervision which will insure their educational merit.

Furthermore the educational purpose of the church in the life of each individual requires that he experience religion as a unifying and cumulative force in his life and not as an element which dissipates interests and loyalties and presents many confusing fragments of experience. If the Sunday School worship program, the class session, the preaching service, the Young People's society or club, the missionary circle, and the midweek party or social all present independent bits of program, unrelated to the others and representing isolated fragments of experience, there is small likelihood that a very definite or sustained spiritual change will result. The time occupied by all these items

combined is little enough if they constitute a unified and cumulative religious experience. Split up into fragments as they are, they tend to neutralize or duplicate rather than reënforce one another, and really get nowhere.

Still more serious, there are vital needs unmet and rich program resources unused by all these agencies since none of them, nor all of them together, take a comprehensive view of the educational task.

One of the director's chief functions as he works with and through his council or board will be gradually to unify these agencies and programs into a comprehensive whole for each age group. Thus, as noted in the last chapter, his first goal is that of the Church School in which all affiliated agencies and programs are unified into one efficient organization. His more distant goal is that the church itself shall become a school in Christian living.

As the scope of the director's responsibility comes to encompass all the agencies providing program elements under the auspices of the church, it is likely that a general administrative officer for the Sunday morning sessions of the Church School will be needed. He may quite properly be called the general superintendent, if it is clear to all concerned that he is an administrative assistant and not the ranking officer of the school.

One general superintendent, who was a capable and successful layman and an excellent superintendent of the promotional type though utterly untrained and unread in religious education, was very eager for his church to employ a director of religious education. He understood that the director would really be an assistant to him and definitely subordinate in rank. When he learned that this director, who had made the same sort of study of religious education that he himself had made of his own profession, was to be the ranking officer in the Church School, his enthusiasm waned.

It has been the experience of several directors that the general superintendent who continues in office after the director is on the job constitutes one of the most serious problems. This is sometimes due to the attitude illustrated above, sometimes to confusion regarding responsibilities and prerogatives, and sometimes to the inability of the superintendent to develop an educational instead of a promotional point of view. If it can be so arranged in advance, the simplest solution is to have the director considered general superintendent during the early period of his ministry while the scope of his functions is likely to be somewhat limited. Then, as he comes more and more to direct the total educational program and to give his Sunday time to the supervision of teaching, he will find it

expedient to place large administrative responsibility on a voluntary superintendent or assistant.

The functions of this administrative officer would be to see to it that the various department programs get started on time, that vacancies in the staff are filled, that visitors and new students are properly classified and introduced, and that the whole school functions smoothly and well. In a fully manned school neither superintendent nor director would be responsible regularly for conducting any of the opening or worship programs. The function is not one of presiding but of administrative management. The director ought to relieve himself of these administrative details, which can be equally well carried by a volunteer officer, in order that he may give himself to those supervisory activities which bring into play his technical ability and professional skill.

In cases where the director finds an efficient superintendent on the job it is likely that, with tact, he can work out a delegation of responsibilities which will leave the superintendent many of his traditional duties and enable the director to move at once into those techniques of supervision which lie beyond the ability of the layman and constitute the director's largest contribution. The director's chief concern with regard to the superintendent is to see to it that he relieves the director of adminis-

trative detail without in any way hindering the educational supervision through which the director seeks to improve the school.

The director thus becomes the unifying and coordinating factor among all those agencies, which, by action of the church, are brought under educational direction. This function he carries, of course, in the same relationship with his board or council as all other functions. He initiates and recommends policies and then executes the actions taken on them by the board.

The next statement to be made regarding the director's functions will be disputed by many directors and some pastors, but it represents the conviction of the writer and must stand or fall upon the reasons here given for it. The director should have a large share in the pastoral work of the church. Contacts with homes, absentees, and those in trouble are just as indispensable to the fullest service of the director as to that of the pastor. The "shepherd heart" is as much a needed qualification of the one as of the other. Instead of the distinction between pastor and director being emphasized at this point it ought to be minimized.

Much of the director's pastoral visitation will be in the interest of winning back to interest and attendance those on whom the church is losing its hold. No efficient director will be satisfied to

carry in the records a large number of names which represent "dead timber." There should be a definite plan for enrolling students on the basis of attendance. There should be an equally definite policy for dropping their names on the basis of nonattendance. But every name dropped, except because of removal, represents a failure of the Church School. No name should be continued after a period of nonattendance not satisfactorily accounted for, yet every effort must be made before the school admits its failure and drops the name. First the teacher will call, then department officers and fellow students. Finally the director himself, and probably the pastor, will call, in an attempt to regain interest before the name is finally dropped Such essential conservation makes the director a copastor.

The discovery and recruitment of new students will involve other pastoral work. The director will organize his staff and student body to do much of this work, yet it will bring him personally into a good many homes as well. Frequently he will be accompanied by the pastor or a member of the Church School staff.

The discovery and enlistment of new leadership will occasion other home visitation, for better acquaintance, evaluation, and conference. The director hardly knows a given potential leader suffi-

ciently to recommend appointment until his acquaintance reaches beyond the church contacts into the home, the vocational relationships if any, and the community relationships. Such acquaintance is possible only through sharing in the pastoral work with very definite purpose.

The supervisory functions to be discussed in the next chapter will involve many contacts of the director with staff members outside the regular Church School period and setting. Many such contacts may be arranged in the director's office, yet the informality and congeniality of a call in the home is often conducive to a much more favorable attitude and atmosphere than is the office situation.

Finally students or staff members who are ill or in trouble of any kind may be helped fully as much by the director as by the pastor. Ideally both should bear the pastoral relationship. Neither alone is quite the equivalent of both and neither can quite afford to sacrifice the values growing out of such pastoral contacts. The attempt to distinguish sharply between the educational and the pastoral functions has impaired both and made for a dual program which is most unfortunate. The problem of the pastor-director relationship and division of functions must be considered later.

The director faces one basic problem, whether

as organizer, executive, or supervisor, both in his relation to his board or council and to his staff and student body, which may properly be stated at this point. This is the problem of discovering and releasing adequate motives for the carrying through of worth-while educational work. However nicely plans are laid and organization is effected, if those who carry responsibility do not have adequate motives for putting their very best abilities and energies into the task, failure, partially at least, is inevitable.

An excellent training school may be planned for leaders, present and prospective. The finest available faculty may be provided even at considerable expense. Every inducement may be held out for enrolling and securing practical help for the responsibilities of Church School leadership. Yet when the school opens, only a small group of all those who need it are present. The greatest problem confronted by those responsible for leadership training is not the provision of opportunities for training. It is to get the people for whom these provisions are made to take advantage of them.

Not infrequently the poorest response to training opportunities will be made by those favored groups within easy reach of the finest training agencies. Here is a church located within a mile of one of the great summer leadership schools providing

annually a six weeks' program led by nationally renowned religious educators. People travel a thousand miles at heavy expense to attend this school. Yet not a leader in the neighboring church has ever taken a course in this or any other training school.

On the other hand, in a rural church here is a busy housewife who has a passion for more effective work in the small Sunday School where she serves. She starts a local training class. Year after year she leads a few of her neighbors in a study of general courses. In the summer she journeys at her own expense to a training school for specialization work. She finally secures her own diploma and also authority to set up a Standard leadership school to serve her own and neighboring churches. Without a complaint she meets with the most meticulous care every requirement for making this school the best possible under the circumstances. She even labors with her own minister, helping him to qualify as an instructor. Against seemingly insuperable difficulties a fine, self-reliant leadership training enterprise serves a whole countryside. Yes, "where there's a will there's a way," and where there isn't a will all the fine ways in the world lead nowhere for they remain untraveled. Many of the director's most difficult problems will rest for their solution upon

the discovery and release of stronger motives for Church School work. Teachers will be regular, dependable, and prepared if they really want to be. Students will be coöperative, loyal, and regular if strong enough motives are released. Parents will back the work of the Church School with hearty coöperation if they value it highly enough and really desire a religious education for their children and themselves. How can we get at stronger motives for Church School work?

This seems like a strange question alongside the claim that it is in its motive power that religion or religious education is, or at least is supposed to be, unique. Ethics can be taught in any school as subject matter or as modes of conduct. Only religion, we say, can undergird ethical teaching with power enough to carry it into life. The church ought to be able not only to discover and release motives strong enough to carry its own program of activities but also to provide motive power for much of life besides. In fact until the spiritual power of religion carries not only an efficient Church School program but very definite motives for the rest of life, something is seriously wrong with the quality of religious experience.

Yet here is the point of our greatest failure today. Irregular attendance, lack of study and responsible participation, lack of dependability on

the part of leaders, indifference of even Christian parents to the church's program for their children, and a small percentage of attendance and participation on the part of church members—all these weaknesses go back to the inadequacy of motives and purposes. How shall religion undergird all of life with incentives to Christian conduct when even its own educational program lags for want of motive power?

The first remedy is to get the church as a whole to share the director's educational ideals and objectives. Various means are available for doing this and the director will likely need to count upon using all of them.

He is helpless without the full coöperation of the pastor. Quite properly the pulpit speaks with greater influence in the average church than does any other agency. Frequent sermons which carry to the whole congregation the educational purposes and ideals of the director and his colleagues are indispensable. These should come from the pastor himself, not from the director as though he were pleading a special cause in which only he is interested.

Much of the pastor's home visitation should bear directly upon the work of the Church School. He should be kept continually informed of the needs for such calling as they are discovered in the

Church School program. The pastor's part thus in promoting the interests of religious education makes it essential that pastor and director work in the very closest coöperative relationships. The director cannot afford to sacrifice the assistance which the pastor's intelligent support will give him in pulpit and home.

Demonstrations of Church School work are effective in developing interest and giving information. The dramatization of Bible or missionary plays before the evening church congregation by class or department, the conduct of the church worship service by a group of Church School students who have planned it themselves under guidance, the telling of a story or the rendering of special music or Bible drill exercises before the church as a whole will arouse interest in and appreciation for the work of the Church School.

One director [1] arranges annually a very elaborate "open house," in which exhibits of every kind of Church School work are shown. The day's program begins in the morning session with a tour by each class of the classrooms of the other classes in some of the departments. Thus the children share the exhibit of their own work with their fellows. A guest speaker preaches on religious education at

[1]Mr. Williard Wickizer, University Christian Church, Des Moines, Iowa.

the morning church service, and the "open house" proper lasts from two to five in the afternoon.

Space permits but a listing of some of the more important items on display on such an occasion. There were dozens of notebooks, posters, maps, scrapbooks, and models, all related directly to the graded lesson courses which were in use. A model of the church mounted on a gigantic map of the world, with ribbons leading to all mission stations reached by the gifts of this church, was the result of one enterprise. A model of a nursery to which they were regularly contributing toys and other gifts had been made by the Primary Department. The Women's Missionary Society coöperated with a missionary display in charge of two real missionaries. A stage with scenery and costumes on display represented the dramatic activities. Motion-picture projectors, art reproductions, stereographs, and opaque picture reflectors were on display, indicating the use of visual methods. Scouting was exhibited elaborately by displays of woodcraft, nature craft, and camp craft.

On the occasion here described a total of 1165 persons, including delegations from twenty other churches, made the rounds. The frequent exclamations of surprise and delight gave evidence that many of these people were getting a new conception of the modern Church School program.

Special visiting days in Church School departments are sometimes used to acquaint the adult constituency with what is going on. Mere "demonstrations," of course, are of questionable value. If two or three children each Sunday bring their parents to observe the regular normal program a more effective and wholesome publicity is gained without impairing the work.

The regular use of carefully prepared bulletins, defining the aims of the program and interpreting it to parents, is effective. The system of carefully made regular reports to parents on the work of each pupil is even more effective. There are many good forms for making such reports, but better than any of these is a personal letter from the teacher about the work of the pupil. A personal call is still more effective if the teacher is skillful enough to talk over frankly the purpose of the program and any problems being confronted in the case of the particular pupil.

Home work carefully laid out, in which parents may assist their children, helps to enlist interest. Posters made by the child or letters written by him at the Church School and carried home have value.

A Church School adaptation of the parent-teacher association is being used effectively by some directors in certain departments. An

adequate adult program in the Church School would include some such plan.

A general survey of the church and the community in which the participation of many workers is secured helps to center interest on educational needs. The whole process of defining aims and of moving forward toward a unified program tends, of course, to create intelligent interest in religious education.

Many a director becomes so interested in the sound educational work he is doing that he has little inclination for publicity or promotion among those not interested. His ability to secure continued support for a high quality of work, and even to maintain his own position, will depend upon his success in getting the church at large to share in the educational ideal and to appreciate the quality of his work. He must therefore combine the offices of organizer, executive, and promoter.

But beyond this general promotion of the educational ideal, the Church School program itself must be so organized and administered as to discover and release new motive resources.

First of all, the program must be on such a level as to win the respect of the students for its serious purpose and its worthiness of their best efforts. Teachers have been discouraged by lack of study and responsible participation on the part of

students and have reduced their expectations to the minimum in the hope that such small and easy tasks as were assigned would be undertaken. A better psychology is to lay out difficult and challenging assignments, with the frank admission that they are exacting but that mastery of them is well worth while. This does not mean the assignment of long and uninteresting memory stunts or investigations which are of doubtful value when achieved. It does mean the organization of the curriculum around the interests of the students and an attempt to create that curriculum out of their own experiences.

The first test of any educational step is that it be interesting to the student. The next test is that it appear to him to be well worth whatever effort it may take. Activities involved in learning to live the Christian life may be chosen and organized in such a way as to be interesting and quite obviously worth while. A curriculum composed of such activities will secure dependable and whole-hearted participation. Such a curriculum is much less dependent upon printed lesson courses than upon skillful leadership. In the next chapter we must face the problem of developing such leaders.

Closely related to the need for a more serious and worth-while type of educational undertaking is the need for definite means of recognizing achievement

in Church School work. It is true that the use of percentage grades, credits, and degrees in general education is under wide and valid criticism. Such systems have worked injustice and discrimination, and aroused quite artificial motives. The system has been the reliance of unskilled teachers and the crutch of a material-centered and obsolete curriculum. Many a school, if put on its own merit, unsupported by the artificial incentives of a credit system, would have to go out of business for want of students.

Yet the fact that taskmasters posing as teachers and bodies of worthless knowledge posing as a curriculum have been able to get by through dependence on a credit system does not mean that real teachers and a vital curriculum must give up all the values that may be derived from a sincere and valid recognition of educational achievement. In fact the Sunday School has to a large extent relied upon a type of recognition much more artificial than a credit system. Its most characteristic device for motivating attendance has been through either contests or awards. The proposal to evaluate and recognize some qualitative factors rather than mere presence in a class certainly marks a forward step educationally. Probably what actually happens in the life of a boy or girl through being in a Church School class is a far more important

consideration than the mere fact of being present. Church membership itself of course is but a form of recognition, which may be much more artificial than recognition based on more clearly defined progressive achievement.

Furthermore, with the whole public educational system, the activity programs such as Scouting, and the fraternal orders with their various degrees all using formal systems of achievement recognition to supplement the motives created by the sheer merit of their programs, it is questionable whether the Church School can justly afford to forego whatever advantages might be derived from a similar plan.

If the whole church were to conceive of itself as a school in Christian living and were to lay out for each of its student members a definite curriculum of Christian activities and experiences through which Christlike personality would be achieved, there seems no valid reason why an attempt should not be made to define the various steps in such achievement. The best way to define them would be through the setting up of certain criteria or standards on the basis of which appropriate recognition would be possible and quite natural. Space permits only the suggestion of such a system and the reiteration of the conviction that the church has made the poorest possible use of the motives here available. There is great need that the levels

of achievement in learning to live the Christian life be defined, step by step, and that achievement recognition, carefully safeguarded from abuses, be used as a source of motives for a higher quality of participation in Church School work.

There ought to be some significance in the fact that the most serious and fruitful educational enterprise in the modern Church School is built quite frankly upon a credit system. Those who have had experience in administering the leadership training program admit, perhaps with much regret, that the whole program is built upon the framework of a credit system and would doubtless collapse without it. It will be a proud day for education (or perhaps for human nature) when motives arising out of sheer interest in the work for its own sake will be strong enough to carry a school system without recourse to credits and degrees. Until that day comes, religious education has as good a right as any other educational enterprise to strengthen the motives on which it relies by a sound, carefully guarded recognition system.

With its whole program reorganized on the basis of definite achievements level upon level, with the criteria and standards for these carefully defined, with suitable recognition for real rather than artificial items of achievement, the church will be prepared to confront her student body with

challenging and worthy undertakings. The church as a school will thus discover and release new resources of motive power.

With the criteria of "active membership" in the church thus clearly defined in the form of a schedule of Christian activities and experiences allowing for large election with a minimum of "required" items, each individual can definitely check his own progress. Pastoral calling, instead of dealing with trivial and passing topics of conversation, might with more profit and better chances of success, deal quite definitely with these well defined programs of Christian activity through which the individual is growing "in grace." Church School teaching, instead of purveying the contents of Quarterlies to listless minds, may become a real analysis, self-evaluation, and reconstruction of experience.

A far more definite fixing of responsibility on the church constituency generally is involved also in such reconstruction of the church program into a curriculum of Christian living. And responsibility is itself a strong creator of motives. If the running of the whole church program becomes an educational enterprise in which all engage, such democratic participation strengthens motives.

It is quite possible that this reconstruction of the total church into a school in Christian living, with

definite matriculation conditions and standards of work or participation, would considerably reduce at the outset the size of the recognized church membership. It is quite certain, however, that it would multiply the church's power. Possibly what we really need is fewer nominal church members and more real religion if we are to get at the bottom of this problem of motives.

CHAPTER VI

The Director as Supervisor

WE COME now to the most needed, the most difficult, and the most fruitful of all the functions of the local church educational specialist. Only a brief interpretation of this function, with little more than a listing of the instruments and techniques available, is here possible. So new is a scientific approach to educational supervision in Church School work that a literature in the field is just beginning to appear. The limited treatment here seeks chiefly to make a case for this as the director's central function rather than to provide a manual or guide in carrying out the function.

The purpose of supervision is the improvement of the quality of the learning-teaching process. It is to be distinguished from the teaching act itself in that it seeks to improve that act by whatever method is available. It is not to be confused with administration, which sets up and maintains the learning-teaching situation but does not necessarily undertake to work directly upon the process itself. It is to be distinguished from promotion of inter-

est in and appreciation for the educational program of the church, for it is concerned with the processes of that program rather than with attitudes toward it. Supervision is less easily distinguished from the executive function since the carrying out of many of the educational policies will be its chief concern. It will involve a continuous testing and self-criticism of those policies and will give rise to their revision at many points.

The reason for insisting upon a clear delineation of supervision as over against the other functions is to make possible a check as to the extent to which the function is actually being discharged. If the administrative machinery of a school is operating smoothly and the institution seems to be in a growing and prosperous condition it is easy to assume that everything is all right and that all the needed supervision, whatever the term may mean, is being provided. In order that such a school be not too well satisfied with itself it is quite necessary that there be definite criteria by which the presence or absence of effective supervision may be indicated. Even churches employing directors are likely to expect everything else of the director but this central function and often he is given little opportunity here. It is doubtful whether many directors ever get a chance at their real supervisory function.

In some ways the word "supervisor" is unsatisfactory. It has become identified in much public-school work with more or less of a "boss" system of inspection and criticism. The resulting attitude has made not uncommon the use of the epithet "snoopervisor" by teachers who resent this domineering interference with their initiative and freedom. On the other hand, the very teacher who least welcomes the visit and counsel of the supervisor is often the one most in need of the assistance which such a specialist ought to be able to give. The whole situation, of course, is a product of an obsolete educational pattern in which pupils are victims of a taskmaster who in turn must come under the authority of an overlord.

The word supervisor carries with it a connotation of authority and control which the true educator would never wish to assume in carrying out the function. Unfortunately voluntary workers in the Church School often assume that, because they give their services, they ought to be allowed to do about as they please. They do not realize that this attitude greatly reduces the value of the service which they render, deprives them of much valuable help which would make their work far more interesting and enjoyable as well as more effective, and also creates many of their problems. A wholesome and coöperative spirit between teacher and

supervisor is probably one of the best incentives in the development of a similar spirit between teacher and pupil. A teacher who resents supervision is likely to have pupils who resent teaching. At any rate the Church School pupil is likely to make as good a claim to any supposed rewards of voluntary service as is his teacher. What does *he* get out of it? Well just what *does* he get out of it, which his teacher doesn't?

Probably the general term, "the improvement of religious education," is more satisfactory than the term "supervision," though it is somewhat awkward. Since much of the supervisory function consists of working directly with teachers to improve their skill, the terms "counseling" and "counselor" are coming into use. For this aspect of supervision certainly these are preferable terms. We may think, therefore, of this function as the effort to improve the quality and fruitfulness of the learning-teaching process by means of certain instruments and through the counseling of a skilled leader with those less skilled.

Among the instruments for the improvement of teaching, the standards of various types are highly important. There are the International Standards in Religious Education[1], consisting of the general Church School standards and those for each

[1] May be secured from the publishers of this book.

department, including also Vacation and Week Day Church Schools. The introduction and use of such a system of standards forms an excellent approach to a supervisory program, since at many points the need for improvement and for guidance therein will become apparent.

Bearing more directly upon teaching ability are the self-rating scales or teacher standards. One of the simplest ways of making a beginning toward such a standard was that followed by a pastor who acted as his own supervisor of teaching. He asked each of his fifty teachers to write out the ten qualifications which seemed most important in a Church School leader. Thirty-six responded with carefully prepared statements. These were placed in the hands of a competent committee selected from outside the church. The committee chose the statement which they considered the best as a standard of qualifications. The Church School staff then voted to accept this statement as their standard for the ensuing year, each pledging himself to approach it as nearly as possible.

Such a standard or rating scales should include three major items: (1) The teacher's general and personal qualifications such as attitudes toward the church, the students, fellow workers, and the work; general education; experience; leadership qualities; and vital religious experience. (2) Special

preparation for Church School leadership, such as regular reading and other provision for growth; leadership training; and Church School experience. (3) Performance, including regularity, preparation, method used, and ability to show results. The development by a staff in a democratic manner of such a rating scale would be a wholesome process.

A plan of teacher certification or accrediting based upon such a scale, and so graduated that it would provide a place of recognition for those who were rather low in the scale with recognition for improvement as a strong incentive to growth, would be an effective instrument. Such a plan is in its experimental stages already. Care should be taken in following the public-school pattern that academic qualifications are rated as secondary to those more definitely related to religious experience and personality. In evaluating teachers of religion it is of supreme importance that those qualities which actually stimulate and guide religious growth in others be given full consideration while those which have less direct bearing on the process be kept in a secondary place.

Among the most effective instruments of supervision in general education are the standard tests and measurements of achievement or progress in various subjects. By selecting from thousands of samples of the penmanship of fourth-grade

children, several which in neatness, legibility, and accuracy are representative, typical, or average, an objective measure or criterion for the penmanship of a given pupil is secured. If samples of his writing are compared with these and also with those representative of the younger and older grades it will be possible to determine whether in penmanship he is with his grade or above it or below it.

A series of mathematical problems selected by a long experimental process to indicate what a sixth-grade student should be able to do may similarly test his ability. Such a test will include problems typical of the sixth grade and also of grades below and above it, so that if the student is either advanced or retarded his performance on the graduated test will indicate the degree of his variation from the norm. Similar tests in other school subjects have been developed and standardized by being tried out in a large number of cases.

Equipped with these tests the supervisor is able to determine whether the pupils in a given class are as advanced as they should be, and also whether they make the expected progress from year to year. Weaknesses in teaching thus revealed can be rectified.

The custom of giving final examinations and periodic tests in general education is one method

of the teacher in determining the progress made by pupils. While this tests the individual pupil, it is in the large a self-test on the part of the teacher. A test involving what the teacher has a right to expect of the pupils, if general failure results, is an evidence of the teacher's failure. The teacher who "flunks" a large proportion of pupils is either unjust or a failure, probably both. The supervisor is concerned, therefore, not only with the standard tests and measurements but also with the periodic tests prepared and administered by the teacher over given units of work.

Tests and measurements have played a large part in improving public education. Have they any place in religious education? Obviously progress in achieving Christlike personality is a far more complex process than acquiring skill in penmanship or reading, or solving problems in arithmetic. Probably the real product eludes accurate measurement altogether. It is easy to test Biblical knowledge, or ethical judgment and choice, by hypothetical situations. To discover how far Biblical ideals control conduct and experience is exceedingly difficult. To find out what response a given pupil will actually make to a situation involving honesty, interracial good will, or control of temper, is possible only through casual observation under uncontrolled conditions, or by setting a

trap for the pupil, which itself involves questionable ethics.

The improvement of religious education, therefore, sets the most difficult of all tasks for the specialist in tests and measurements. There are essential knowledge outcomes which can be quite readily tested. While a test of attitudes through proposing hypothetical situations calling for hypothetical responses is subject to considerable error due to its unreality, it is far more accurate than a mere guess. There is always the opportunity to verify it by observation of some real situations. Activity programs under Church School leadership will certainly provide many real tests and evidences of the effectiveness of such leadership in the direction of Christian conduct and attitudes. But it is essential that the observer be on the alert for such outcomes and that definite criteria for their evaluation be in mind.

Standardized tests of Biblical knowledge and hypothetical ethical judgments and attitudes may be secured from the publishers of this book.[1] These will be suggestive of the form of objective tests which may be devised by the teacher and supervisor for periodic testing of given units of

[1] Church School Examination Alpha and Sunday School Examination A. Price, 10 cents apiece. Westminster Press, Philadelphia.

work. One value of introducing such tests will be in the self-critical attitude which it will tend to develop in the teacher.

Of course leadership training of all types, both formal, or accredited, and informal, is perhaps the major means for the improvement of teaching. Classes and schools form an indispensable way of training "wholesale" as it were. They greatly multiply the reach of a single instructor or counselor. But the more effective type of training is that of guided practice right on the job, which we call counseling. Formal courses should always be supplemented by apprentice work, and even after an apprenticeship has been served, continuous counseling is needed to insure growth.

Class visitation followed by personal conference is the most direct method of giving such help. In class visitation the counselor should spend the full period in one class so as to observe the total experience provided for the students. A short call after the class is in session creates an abnormal situation while the presence of the counselor from the beginning is soon taken for granted and ceases to be a disturbing factor. The counselor is present in the rôle of a student rather than of a teacher. From the standpoint of the pupils he ought to be regarded as an honored guest coming in to share their interesting work rather than as one who is

there to inspect, or demonstrate, or even to help. His presence ought to involve the least possible variation from the normal situation.

The counselor should have definitely in mind certain items to be observed and certain criteria of evaluation. A "check list" [1] may be helpful, though it ought not to be in evidence during the observation. The counselor may take charge of the class at some point, or may participate if the teacher requests, but he ought not to push himself forward or assume any other attitude before the students than that of a visitor. Certainly his effort throughout should be to increase the appreciation of the pupils for their teacher. This forbids anything but commendation in their presence.

The visit should be followed during the next few days by a personal conference with the teacher in which the class session is reviewed and evaluated. Beginning with commendation of those features for which sincere appreciation can be expressed, the counselor will seek to get the teacher herself to recognize and point out the weak places. Together they will face the problems which arose both as to individual pupils and as to items of method. The counselor will get the teacher to suggest, so far as she is able, her own solutions to the problems. His

[1] Munro, Harry C., "The Church as a School," pp. 194-196. Bethany Press, 1929.

own suggestions will be given in the form of, "Had you ever thought of trying this?" or, "Miss X. has been having success by doing this," or: "I brought over Dr.——'s new book in which, in Chapter V, you will find some interesting suggestions. Suppose we experiment with them a little." The counselor will refrain from such expressions as, "You should have done this," or, "Your method here was wrong." Such a conference should leave the teacher encouraged, but not self-satisfied, eager for the next class session and for the next visit of the counselor.

Workers' conferences, by departments and of the whole Church School faculty, are valuable assets in a counseling program. They ought to be educational rather than chiefly administrative and should aim at the development of the professional spirit and attitude and the building of staff morale.

Directed reading with book reviews and discussions, as well as discussion of current magazine articles, is a decided aid in connection with counseling and leadership training.

Visitation to other Church Schools and to public schools, especially progressive or experimental schools, is highly suggestive. A regular schedule should be followed providing for a substitute. The visit should be made with definite purpose, the items to be observed being clearly in mind. Re-

ports on such visits should be made, with evaluation of procedures observed and notation of helpful changes which might be introduced in the light of such observations. The purpose of public-school visitation is not so much for help in method as to give a better grasp of the students' experience and knowledge background by familiarity with the public-school situation, in which he spends such a large proportion of his waking hours.

Experimentation with new types of method or of curriculum, with schedule changes or organizational changes, and with tests of pupil achievement and attitudes, helps to keep a fresh, creative approach in the work of a staff.

Counseling is perhaps more a matter of art than of technique. The authority of the counselor is never that of position or of personality but rather his own recognition of the same authority under which the teacher comes—the authority of sound educational principles and effective procedure. He stands on the same level with the teacher simply as an interpreter of this authority common to both, and as a helper toward more fruitful and satisfying work. A thoroughly pupil-centered consciousness on the part of both counselor and teacher will prevent the self-consciousness of either.

The necessity of true humility on the part of the counselor is obvious. Consummate tact is an es-

sential qualification in dealing with many situations which will arise, particularly in view of the fact that the counselor deals with a voluntary staff totally unaccustomed to supervision. Not only must he preserve the best good will toward himself on the part of his staff, but he must be a source of continued inspiration and morale for these workers. If they are to have the necessary enthusiasm for their work much of it must be caught from his own contagious zeal.

Like many another type of helpfulness, the counselor's problem is not so much one of giving help outright as of stimulating self-help, and this almost deserves a place among the fine arts. Ideally, also, the help of the counselor ought never to be given except when specifically requested. Rather than to offer help outright or to request the privilege of observation and conference, it would be far more wholesome, even though more difficult, for the counselor to make all his approaches indirect, biding the time when a request will come, voluntarily, for his help and counsel.

If the discovery and release of adequate motives is a basic problem in the total Church School program, certainly this is greatly intensified with respect to the leadership. One of the first outcomes of a soundly educational program in the church will be the greatly increased demands made

upon the leadership—demands for more time, better preparation, deeper devotion. Whether the larger, richer, more fruitful program is possible at all is largely a question of whether a leadership can be enlisted which is willing to pay the price in training, effort, and time.

One solution, perhaps the simplest, is the remuneration of Church School leaders. A nominal honorarium, which is based upon certain qualifications as to training and performance, at once puts into effect a standard which might be difficult to maintain with strictly volunteer workers. The introduction of this plan has brought immediate improvement in the work of some churches which have tried it. While there are serious objections to such a system from the standpoint of cost, of the particular motives operative, and of the closing thus of the Church's largest and most fruitful field of voluntary service, it will likely become much more common in the wealthier and more aristocratic type of church where money is sometimes more plentiful than consecrated life.

A plan which goes far toward the same fruitful outcomes, with few disadvantages, is that whereby the church provides, entirely at its own expense, the fullest opportunities for the training of its leaders. This would include not only well taught leadership training classes and schools within easy

access but also expenses for courses in summer leadership schools and conferences and all the reading and textbook materials needed. These provisions would be made with the understanding that service would be rendered in return.

In addition to the provision of training, the recognition of achievement and service helps to motivate leadership. An impressive ceremony of installation, or consecration of the whole staff annually, is effective. Certain vows may be taken at such a time: by the workers to render faithful service; by the board or council to provide every needed facility; and by the whole congregation to coöperate heartily in the efforts of the staff. Various types of "teachers' contracts" or "workers' covenants" are in use, with generally favorable results in better motivation.

In all his relationships with his staff the director will be conscious of himself as a teacher of teachers, arousing interest and creating motives through his own enthusiastic quest for the richer life and more fruitful service in just the same manner in which he hopes to have his teachers inspire and lead their students. Much of their motivation will be derived from the contagion of his own ideals and aspirations.

The assumption has been throughout this discussion that the director himself would personally be

the supervisor throughout the program. Certainly he will be responsible for seeing that an adequate provision is made for such improvement as will come only through supervision. However, in a large Church School with fifty or more classes it is obvious that contacts with each class cannot be sufficiently frequent to be effective. The director will, therefore, begin as an essential part of his supervisory program the development of a supervisory staff.

Ideally the principal or superintendent in each department should be first of all a counselor, sufficiently freed by helpers from administrative detail to give major attention to the improvement of teaching. Because the traditional duties of the department superintendent are purely administrative, it may be better to continue such an officer and add the counselor as a special helper of teachers. The methods and purposes of counseling should already have been made plain by the work of the director. He should stay with the counseling program in a department until the teachers begin to appreciate its helpfulness and not only accept but request such assistance. With the principle thus well established he may turn the function over largely to a department supervisor.

The most natural person for such a department counselor will be the teacher who has made the

best response to the director's counseling and is personally best qualified for such an exacting responsibility. First in assistance to the director in his counseling, and then with careful coaching, such a teacher may become a very successful counselor.

Another common source of department counselors is the public school staff. A teacher or supervisor from the public-school system serving in the corresponding grades has many advantages. She is familiar with educational standards. She knows the corresponding public-school curriculum and method, which constitute the educational background of the students. She understands and takes for granted the principle of supervision. She is likely to have the respect and confidence of Church School teachers because of her public educational standing. The opportunities of a counseling position may appeal to her much more strongly than those of a teacher or other worker.

Yet there are grave dangers to be guarded against in placing a public-school worker in such an influential position. The purpose, method, and pattern of the Church School should be quite different from those of the public school. Except in a few progressive schools, public education is as material-centered as religious education of the mediocre type. Public-school influence instead of setting

Church School work free to develop as experience in Christian living may stultify and deaden it. It is only when religious education goes beyond public education in the realm of personality development and motives for living that it comes into its own. Therefore, unless public-school workers have made a special study of religious education and are willing to lead Church School teachers considerably beyond public-school ideals and objectives, there is little help that they can give as Church School counselors. Successful public-school supervision is no adequate preparation for Church School supervision.

Sometimes ex-school-teachers, with the rich background of training and experience which they have had in public-school work supplemented by experiences of parenthood and Church School leadership, make excellent supervisors.

One thing is clear. Supervision is such an exacting and delicate function that it had better be attempted only as qualified leaders can be developed for it. The director will develop a supervisory program and that only very gradually. Starting probably in the lower grades, he will establish the function there and train assistants to carry on as he moves into the older departments. By the time he gets into the adolescent grades, the fruitage of supervision in the younger grades will

begin to be so apparent that the more difficult and complicated problems of supervision in the higher grades will more readily yield. All agencies and programs affecting each age group should be brought under supervision, both for the purpose of unifying them and because program elements not under supervision may be counteracting many of the purposes and values of the educational program. This will mean that Vacation Church School work, week-day religious education, Young People's societies and activity programs, midweek social and study enterprises, shall be included in a comprehensive supervisory plan.

The development of a system of leadership training through classes, schools, conferences, and apprentice work will be an essential aspect of a complete supervisory program. With the supervisory staff as teachers in such a system a relationship is developed which makes supervision easy and natural. Practice work then becomes a regular part of the training program. The students naturally look for help and guidance to their teacher-counselors.

It is clear that we have outlined here a difficult and laborious function for the director—particularly so because it will be the function least expected of him and least appreciated by the church at large. The easiest thing for him to do is simply

to become so loaded with duties as organizer, executive, administrator, and promoter, that he never gets the time and opportunity to draw upon the resources of a supervisory program.

It is not uncommon for directors to grant quite readily the central place of supervision, ideally at least, in their work and yet to lament their inability to undertake it because of the sheer load of the other more obtrusive and self-evident functions. Yet the true educator will never permit himself to be deprived of this function so basic to qualitative improvement in the program. He will continually be on the lookout for voluntary helpers on whose shoulders administrative detail can be unloaded. He will undertake a systematic education of his staff, his board or council, and his church as a whole, in the viewpoint that here is where his largest and most distinctive contribution is to be made.

The emphasis given to supervision here is not intended as an attempt to add to the burdens of already overworked directors. Rather, it is proposed as a reason for placing on unsalaried and less skilled workers many of the duties which now claim the director's time and energy, setting him free to do the one thing in the program which most thoroughly justifies his employment and the training which he should have had.

The place of the general superintendent of the Sunday morning session of the Church School, with a complete staff of department superintendents, should be here reiterated as one means of setting the director free for supervision. In Sunday evening group meetings and social activities through the week, adult advisers and administrators should also be available, leaving the director free to evaluate, counsel, and help generally in improving the quality of the processes under way. The director will best justify his employment, his profession, and himself, not by loading up with a multitude of duties formerly carried by volunteer workers but by moving out into a function for which volunteer workers are unqualified.

CHAPTER VII

The Director's Relationship with the Pastor

THE MOST prolific source of difficulties to the new profession has been in this relationship. In interviewing directors whose tenure of service has been brief, the minister more frequently than any other factor in the situation is cited as the cause of the difficulty. In interviewing pastors who have been associated with directors it is not uncommon to find a rather strong prejudice against the profession, with reasons which seem quite plausible.

On the other hand there are ministers and directors who are inseparable in their mutual loyalty and appreciation. The writer was once requested successively by a minister and by a director who had formerly been associated with him to help to find a church in which they could again be brought into this happy relationship. They had been separated because the church was not able financially to continue a dual leadership. Each was willing to leave a good position and begin work elsewhere if it would bring him into relationship with the other again.

Few situations will be found in which this relationship is not a prominent factor. Either there are antagonisms or strong mutual loyalties. This means that the careful matching of personalities and the frank facing of this necessarily intimate relationship are essential in the calling of a director. In outlining the more common causes of difficulty we are not disparaging the personnel of either profession but merely calling attention to factors which must be faced in seeking an amicable relationship.

There are some factors for which the director is primarily responsible. His attitudes have sometimes made a happy relationship difficult. Whether characteristic of the personnel of directors generally or inculcated in them by professional schools, there has been a tendency for directors to be overzealous of their professional prerogatives. Anxiety for professional recognition and rank, if consciously cultivated, can easily surpass anxiety for rendering service. The director may have perfectly valid reasons for claiming the same professional standing as the minister. He can injure his standing and his profession no more tragically than by forcing those claims when others fail to recognize them. He must suffer, as one of the handicaps of a new and unestablished profession, the silent waiting and unpretentious humility

through which tardy recognition may finally be won. The attitude of superiority, presumption, and professional pride, however well justified in the director's own mind, has frequently deprived him of such recognition as would quite likely have been won ultimately by an opposite spirit.

Overconsciousness of the difficulties involved in the delicate pastor-director relationship has led to an attempted solution by some directors through a policy of isolation and independence. A clear definition and delimitation of the director's functions and those of the pastor as lying in quite separate areas gives the director a field in which he is unquestionably the ranking officer and the authority. He runs the "Church School program" and the pastor runs the "church program." Once the lines between the two fields are surveyed and the fences built, there can be no difficulties of relationship, for contacts are reduced to a minimum. This divisive policy sacrifices the program to solve a personal difficulty and in the long run is disastrous both for director and for pastor, for neither can afford thus to be shut out of a great area of indispensable service and influence. The problem of pastor-director relationship cannot be solved by dodging it.

Even when the divisive policy of a dual program is not followed, some directors are charged with

failure to counsel sufficiently with the pastor and to seek to integrate their service and plans with the total church program. They are charged with either openly or unwittingly disparaging those aspects of the program for which they are not responsible, such as preaching, evangelistic meetings, and general church fellowship. Failing to cultivate throughout their range of influence an appreciation for the work of the pastor, they can hardly expect him to cultivate appreciation for their work. The charge that the pastor's part of the program is unsound educationally does not help to increase his appreciation for the educational program.

A characteristic charge made against the director is that he is a theorist, his plans and programs being impractical, while the pastor, on the other hand, is practical. Do not the preaching and pastoral labors of the latter bring continuous accessions to the church? Let the director show some "results." The director is at fault here only in so far as he emphasizes the differences between the educational program and the traditional church program rather than emphasizing how much they have in common. With courage and clear-cut definition of reasons the director will take issue here and there with program elements or methods which violate his educational purposes. However, he might better tolerate some liabilities for a time

than get himself discredited as an impractical theorist.

The director is at fault frequently in his failure to cultivate in the pastor a better understanding and appreciation of the educational method. Not infrequently one of the director's first and most important students will be the pastor. He must not be approached as a student, however, but rather as a sharer in a common enterprise. The counsel and advice sought of him will have its wholesome reactions on his own attitudes. Many a pastor could be induced to read well into the educational viewpoint if he felt that his director genuinely appreciated his counsel on educational matters. It is well to remember also that the pastor, while he may lack technical religious-educational background, has a rich fund of experience in dealing with people and a wide practical knowledge of human nature. His judgment will be a most wholesome check on that of the director in matters involving real educational policy. First of all, therefore, the director must interpret and justify his own educational purposes and program to the pastor.

Failure to get along with people is also a frequent charge against the director. If this is due in part to the difficult and delicate problem of human relationships which his work involves, it is

all the more important that he be a master of this fine art of "getting along with folks." There should be a course in "human engineering" in all schools of religious education, in order that prospective directors may have all the help which practical psychology can give them in this respect. Those lacking in radiant, attractive, tactful personality should be discouraged from entering a vocation in which relationships are so important and so exacting.

Analysis of numerous cases in which pastor-director relationships have been strained places not a little blame on the pastor. There are unmistakable evidences of jealousy over the success and recognition which come to the well qualified director whose program and leadership begin to claim central place in the consciousness of the congregation. This is indeed a real test of grace when the long experience of the pastor in being the central figure in the church's program is considered. Such a bifocal consciousness on the part of the congregation leaves him quite ill at ease. It is natural to fall back on the subterfuge, "The church is the thing, and these side issues must not detract from the church"—"the church" meaning here, of course, the preaching service. No pastor has a right to call a qualified director without definitely committing himself to share equally with

him the place in the church's life and consciousness ordinarily held by the pastor alone. The pastor, as well as the director, needs to remember the saying, "There is no limit to the good which a man can do if he doesn't care who gets the credit."

Occasionally the attitude which a minister develops toward his director indicates that his motives in seeking to bring a director into the service of the church were somewhat questionable. What he really wanted was an assistant, who would relieve him of some detail, carry some of his less favored responsibilities, and by the magic of religious education on the side bring success to a ministry which was not quite "getting over." The minister who in seeking a director is thinking of himself rather than of the needs of growing life obviously places the director in a most difficult and unfair position. The minister who hopes to get an assistant under the guise of a religious educator is unfair both to church and to director. Happy relationships can hardly be expected.

Not infrequently the minister's attitude is: "I have my work and he has his. Let him make good if he can." Such an attitude means almost certain failure, since it is only by the backing and support of the pulpit that the essential interest and coöperation of the congregation as a whole can be won for the new enterprises and larger program which the

director is sure to launch. The pastor can and does use the pulpit to promote whatever enterprises he may wish his church to back. Unless he is willing to use the pulpit equally to secure backing for the enterprises and purposes of the director, he places his colleagues at a hopeless disadvantage. The pastor who does not regularly and consistently promote the educational program and support the director personally, from the pulpit and in pastoral work and business meetings, places the director at a hopeless disadvantage. The pastor's silence is a most effective negation of the director and his program with a large and influential portion of the congregation.

Quite aside from the question of rank in the church staff, the recognition of the director as an authority in educational matters should be freely granted by the pastor. Unless the director is qualified to speak with higher authority in educational policies and principles than is the pastor, then the pastor himself should be the director. What such a pastor needs is not a director but an assistant to relieve him of administrative detail so that he can himself direct the educational program. It is both unfair and shortsighted to place a technically trained religious educator in such a position, for dissatisfaction is certain to result.

Another source of uneasiness on the part of the

pastor, leading almost certainly to friction, is the pastor's unwillingness to have the total church program placed upon an educational basis. Not infrequently the pastor is quite eager to have a director, with the understanding that he will simply build up a large and successful Sunday School, which will feed into and strengthen the church but will in no essential way affect the character of the program of the church proper. Such a hope is built upon an inadequate conception of what is involved in a sound educational program and of the inevitable bearing which such a program must have on all the religious agencies and influences touching the life of the church membership.

As soon as it becomes evident that the educational viewpoint demands the same carefully adapted and directed program for childhood and youth that the pastor is already providing in part for adults, he wonders if the loyalty and allegiance of this younger constituency to the "church" is not being sacrificed, thinking as he does of the program which centers in himself. He is likely to urge some plan by which this youthful congregation is brought in to swell the attendance at the "church service." At this point the director, if he is worthy of his responsibility, will insist that those portions of the program which are looked upon as essential for the younger groups must come under his supervision to

insure their educational values and their unity and consistency with other church experiences which these same children and youth are having. The minister may quite sincerely question the director's right to extend his control into the regular church service, even at this point, and friction begins.

Or perhaps the church plans a special evangelistic campaign. Naturally the evangelist expects to draw a good many from the Church School constituency. Knowing the high-pressure methods used upon childhood and youth in the name of evangelism by some followers of that profession, the director may oppose such a meeting. If he does not quite dare to oppose it he will limit as far as possible its reach into the group of children and young people for whose spiritual growth he is responsible, knowing that the kind of music to which they will be introduced and the conceptions of worship and other types of religious experience which will be presented will constitute liabilities which it will take months of patient leadership and program-building to overcome. The director's failure to promote the evangelistic campaign vigorously and sidetrack his regular program for it will perhaps be interpreted by the pastor as unwillingness to coöperate and failure to "play the game," whereas the director's interest is in an evangelism which will meet the real needs of chil-

dren and youth. Obviously the director might quite eagerly promote the intensification of the evangelistic note in the church program if it could be done in such a way as to constitute an asset rather than a liability in the educational program. The director, in the very nature of the case, ought to be the one to determine what sort of evangelistic emphasis will serve the needs and not increase his difficulties. At the same time the director should not ignore the aims of true evangelism. At any rate the pastor is not quite ready for the services of a director until he is willing to have the church's recruitment policy reconstructed so as to be consistent with educational ideals and principles.

But the hypothetical evangelistic campaign is only one example. If the pastor expects the educational program to be the program of the church and not that of another institution, he must be prepared to have the church's program reconstructed according to educational principles. Ultimately he will discover that only two alternatives are open. He may isolate the church program from the educational program and then find the latter developing a separate consciousness and loyalty and detracting from the actual strength of the church. A separate Church School will not and cannot deliver to the church a loyal and trained membership if the church runs its program by different

principles and ideals from those governing the Church School. Or he may bring the total church program under the control of educational principles and ideals, converting the church itself into a school in Christian living. He will then find all the resources of the educational method available for strengthening the church. When the pastor is ready to choose the second alternative, he is ready to associate a director with himself to help to lead the total unified program.

It is difficult for the pastor to escape a lurking fear that such a thorough reconstruction of the church's program as will make it a school in Christian living may decidedly change his own place and function in the church. Will his talents and skills then be needed? Will his professional training and experience still be the asset they are in the present program? Dare the pastor encourage the church to rethink its nature and function into a new conception? It requires an unusual degree of grace and courage for a successful pastor to contemplate any very disturbing change in his status and function. Possibly this director is but a theorist and this modern religious education but a passing fad anyway. Perhaps, after all, the traditional program which revolved around the pulpit had better not be disturbed by this experiment in religious education. So reasons the pastor out of his mis-

givings over his own place in the new program, and the director finds his backing and coöperation reduced to a barely respectable minimum.

Friction develops from the pastor's side also because of a failure to understand the functions of an educational specialist. In all sincerity and with the welfare of the church and the director genuinely at heart, he may question some of the policies and undervalue some of the activities upon which the director places much stress. His failure to understand may give rise to definite misunderstanding, with friction and disastrous cross purposes as a result.

In addition to these causes of unhappy relationship between pastor and director, which may be largely in one or the other of the persons involved, there are problems inherent in the situation itself which make right relationships difficult even when the best of intelligent good will exists on both sides.

The profession is new and consequently on trial. The ministry is taken for granted as essential leadership in any church. The minister as an individual is seldom considered an experiment by a congregation, and the profession as such never is. This, therefore, gives the minister a sense of security and a standing which adds greatly to his peace of mind and efficiency in service. With the director, both the man and the profession are considered

more or less of an experiment. The director is thus placed in an embarrassing position in which he must take every opportunity to make himself and his profession secure. If difficulties and misunderstandings result, they may be blamed largely upon the newness of the profession rather than on either director or minister.

The director's functions have been poorly defined, or variously defined, and this has opened the way for misunderstandings and differences of opinion. Also the title "director of religious education" has been applied to workers ranging all the way from general assistants or church secretaries to highly specialized technicians. A careful definition of functions and relationships, subject to periodic revision in the light of changing needs and a growing program, should be prerequisite to the employment of a director. This may be worked out in preliminary conferences between director and Church School board or council, but it ought to be stated in some detail and be satisfactory to all concerned before the work is actually entered upon. The study leading to such a definition would be educationally most wholesome.

A further difficulty arises out of the problem of developing and administering a unified program with dual leadership. It would be so much simpler for minister and director to agree upon a

division of the program and responsibilities into two fairly distinct jobs and then each go about his own with full freedom and full responsibility. So attractive and simple has this solution seemed that it has actually been sought as the way out in many situations. Yet neither can quite afford the dualism which thus develops, to say nothing of the sacrifice of the highest spiritual interests of those for whom the whole program exists and both leaders labor.

A unified program is essential from the pastor's standpoint. He cannot afford to be cut off from groups or *blocs* of his constituency. Young people cannot be properly related to the church unless the pastor has a real place in the church's program for youth. The pastor, as he should, symbolizes the church for them as no one else can. If the program is so divided that they are chiefly identified with a group of programs that are consciously separate from the church so-called, while the pastor is chiefly identified with an adult program which is the church so-called, the pastor has little opportunity to make effective contacts with youth and youth has little reason to seek either the pastor or the church. A dual program almost inevitably alienates the pastor from youth, and youth from the church.

Furthermore the pastor must build the church of to-morrow out of the youth of to-day. In fact,

the church of to-day can be firmly builded only by the educational method in which adults as well as young people become growing, serviceable, Christians. For the pastor to turn over all the educational work to the director would be to abdicate his true church leadership. He cannot afford to be an absent or even a minor factor in all this educational program.

There is also the danger of adult groups substituting a "Sunday School experience" of religion for a real program of Christian education. It is an alternative quite unfair to the minister, to the church member, and to the church itself, to give people their choice between Sunday School and church. Some will choose one, some the other, while there are those who will take both even though they are quite unrelated, or largely duplicates. A unified, rich, cumulative program might serve the whole number better and definitely strengthen the church itself.

As a matter of fact the pastor is as dependent upon sound educational method and rich educational program to fulfill his functions properly as is the director. Sermons, worship, pastoral work, organizational work, all should be educationally sound and purposeful. "In fact," as a speaker recently said, "I don't know of anything that the church or pastor does which is not educational if

properly done, unless perhaps it is conducting a funeral, and sometimes I think that that might be made quite educational." For the pastor to turn all educational leadership to some one else and satisfy himself with functions which are noneducational would be ministerial suicide.

One of the pastor's chief purposes in calling a director may well be to secure his expert assistance in giving every aspect of the church program—worship, service, fellowship, sermons, and business—a sound educational basis. The director will assist the pastor chiefly in helping him to take advantage of the best means and methods of educational procedure in all his work. The pastor should call the director on the assumption that he will be a great aid in a reconstruction of the church's total program, making it soundly educational throughout. He foolishly limits the director's usefulness by shutting him out or ignoring him in shaping general church policies. If the director is not qualified to deal with these larger aspects of the church program, subjecting them all to the test of educational efficiency and soundness, he is a doubtful asset as a real director.

A unified program is also essential from the director's standpoint. No matter how excellent may be the educational features which are provided under his direction, if elsewhere in the church's

program are features which violate sound educational principles his own efforts will be neutralized, unless he is able to keep those for whom he is responsible from coming under such influences. Suppose, for example, that great pains have been taken to teach young people to like and to use the better type of hymn in their worship. Then suppose that the evening church service continues to popularize the sort of syncopated trash so useful in a gospel "pep" meeting. Much of the director's labor is in vain. A case is on record in which a director had spent years in winning his Senior group to the whole-hearted and appreciative use of one of the finest young people's hymnals. A professional evangelist and his singer held a meeting for this church which virtually demoralized the educational program during its progress. After the meeting the Senior group rebelled against a return to the better hymnal and the director was forced to compromise with a much inferior type of music for which a special book was secured. Years of worship training were dissipated by influences over which the director had no control.

The church's educational program can succeed only with the whole church back of it. The support of the pulpit is indispensable. Only by a unified program which is the program of the church can the director be assured of church-wide backing.

The moment he accepts a segment of program as his sole responsibility, he must count on only a segment of church backing and interest. By identifying himself with the total program the director may be assured of the necessary support.

The educational goal of the director for each growing life must be a full experience of the church's privileges. This rich church consciousness should develop not only as the climax in adulthood but to the limit of the capacity of each age group. The child needs to feel his conscious identity with the whole "communion of the saints" as much as does the adult, perhaps more. A dual or divided program over only one section of which the director exerts any controlling influence makes it impossible for him to insure such an experience to each age group. His own educational program, therefore, will be impaired because partial. Or, if the wider experience be provided, it may be of such a character as to jeopardize rather than to reënforce the educational objectives.

Religion should normally be a stabilizing, unifying, integrating force in all experience. It ought to be a view of life as a whole. It ought to help to organize all experience into a consistent, meaningful whole. If the agencies through which children or youth gain religious experience are divisive, unrelated, and confusing, religion becomes a dis-

turbing and disintegrating factor in experience. Instead of helping to unify and stabilize life it helps to confuse. Only through a unified program can religious experience be provided which will function efficiently as religion should in growing life.

It becomes evident that pastor and director, for the best interests of both and of the persons whom both seek to serve, must work together on one church program which will make provision for all groups to have a full Christian experience. This means that the "we spirit" is simply indispensable. There can be no fences. Unless constant teamwork is possible and easy, the relationship may as well be dissolved.

Who is to be the ranking officer? Neither director nor pastor will care since their relationships will be on that fine Christian plane—"each counting other better than himself." In the minds of the congregation and the community the minister will be the ranking officer. There is too much tradition and sentiment back of this to make the questioning of it worth while. Theoretically there is no reason why the pulpit ministry should be the ranking office. It may not always be. The writer knows of one case in which it is not. The director and the minister whose personal relationships are what they should be will spend little time or energy settling rank. The only rivalry will be in service and love.

The actual process of program-building already sketched will be a joint enterprise of pastor and director. They will work together upon it, for it is one program. The implication of this is that the functions which have been described as those of the director will be shared at many points by the pastor. In every step of the process of organizing the program, recommending the policies, and adjusting the organization, the director will make no move which has not first been thought through in all its implications with the pastor. Conversely the pastor will take no significant step in organization, policy, or program development which has not been thought through in all its implications with the director. Each will count it absolutely essential to carry the other with him. In cases where a frank facing of the issue results in failure to agree upon a given step, the one who desires to take this step will not sufficiently trust his own judgment to venture upon it alone. This requires of each a high degree of respect for the judgment of the other.

Director and pastor will stand together before both official board of session and Church School board or council, backing one another in all policies and withholding any recommendation until it can be brought jointly. There will be such mutual appreciation and respect that lines of cleavage

and recognition of credit will be forgotten. Pastor and director will likewise work toward such harmony between these governing bodies of the church and Church School respectively that they will draw closer and closer together. When the church board has grasped the full educational viewpoint and purpose of the Church School council and the Church School council has come to think in terms of a total church program, the time may come when the two can be identified as the governing body of a church which conceives of itself as a school in Christian living.

As pastor and director thus share the leadership of a unified program, responsibilities and functions will be shared rather than sharply divided. Effective administration of course makes necessary a definition of responsibilities and functions in each case. Such distinctions will be based upon the abilities and aptitudes of the respective leaders, and upon administrative expediency rather than upon prerogatives or rank. There will be a group of functions which belong quite clearly to the pastor. There will be another group which belong to the director. Each will bring to these respective functions his own peculiar assets of personality, training, and experience. Then there will be a rather wide range of functions which belong strictly to neither but in which responsibility is shared in

the fullest sense. The wider this middle ground of mutuality becomes, the larger will be the potential service of each and the more unified will be the dual leadership.

The pastor's contribution in leadership will be made out of the rich experience, the prestige, and the tested means and methods of the ministry with its rich and fruitful past. He will contribute the qualities of true church craft, having a broad view of the church's total interests as an institution. He will be concerned that each individual shall have opportunity for a full experience of the privileges and opportunities which the church offers. He will usually also have very strong assets of personality, deep spiritual power, and general leadership qualities.

The director's contribution will be to make available the instruments, materials, and techniques of modern religious education in the whole program. He will be able to evaluate all elements of the church program with respect to their educational merits and purpose. The strong tradition and resources of program, experience, and trained leadership of the Sunday School and other agencies as separate institutions will, through his leadership, be gradually ceded to the church itself. He will likewise have a special sensitiveness to the needs of children and young people, which have been so

largely overlooked in the traditional church program.

These peculiar contributions to the total leadership made by each of these professional workers will determine to some extent where the two general fields of service will lie. A specific definition of these fields is so largely dependent on the qualifications and desires of the two persons involved, and on the local conditions, that it should be worked out in each particular situation.

Many of the executive, administrative, and pastoral responsibilities will be shared or assigned by mutual consent on certain well defined principles. First, this sharing ought not to be such as to limit either director or pastor permanently to contact with certain groups or certain program elements. If the director is usually identified with the program for childhood and youth while the pastor is identified with that for adults, neither can render his largest service. The director must reach and influence the adult program, both to insure its educational quality and to secure support for the program of childhood and youth. The pastor must have effective contacts with children and young people as a regular, natural, and normal part of his pastoral leadership, or pastor, young people, and church will all suffer.

Also, the arrangement should be flexible so that

pastor and director may occasionally exchange functions to give each new contacts and wider influence. The pastor must know his young people as well as his adults. The director must get into the homes of the church. Overspecialization is too narrowing to permit adequate leadership on the part of either pastor or director.

Finally, it should be recognized that the relationship of pastor and director differs essentially from that of pastor and assistant or associate in only one particular. The director's qualifications make him an educational authority whose counsel and judgment the pastor will gladly accept and follow when educational issues are at stake. Otherwise he shares the pastoral leadership of the congregation in much the same way as does an associate or assistant. Let it be reiterated that if the pastor does not accept the educational leadership of his colleague, then what he has is an assistant, not a director. But with the necessary matching of personalities to make a success of this intimate relationship, rank, titles, and prerogatives will be forgotten in the rivalry of love and service.

CHAPTER VIII

»«

The Director's Qualifications and Growth

THE JOB analysis which we have given of the director's functions and relationships clearly sets a very high standard of qualifications both in personality and in technical knowledge and skill. His relationships with his board or council, the delicate relationships involved in supervision of a volunteer staff, those intimate relationships with the minister, all demand a personality of rare tact, boundless good will, amiable disposition, and undiscouraged optimism. Prophetic courage and passion for a cause must be tempered by common sense, poise, and sound judgment.

The young person who decides to go into religious education because he does not feel that his personality is sufficiently forceful, dynamic, and attractive for the ministry, has made a sad mistake. A rich and radiant personality will be as much an asset, indeed as much an essential, in the one case as in the other. The young person who would like to do church work and feels that he is not sufficiently "spiritual" or devotionally minded to be a

minister but decides that religious education will not require quite so much "personal religion" has made an equally grave mistake.

The problems and demands of educational leadership in the church are such that the cream of the available ministerial material ought to be induced to undertake this harder job. Instead of being a second-rate profession into which those who don't quite make the ministry may still find a field of usefulness, religious education, because of its newness and its potential future, should recruit only the choicest of raw material. The standing of the profession to-day is jeopardized by the fact that the early demands so far exceeded the supply of qualified workers that low standards of qualification and preparation were possible. A rigid tightening of standards is needed if a real profession is to develop.

As one becomes acquainted with the various professions devoted to the alleviation of human diseases and physical disabilities he discovers several rather distinct groups each with its own viewpoints, theories, and methods of treatment. There are the many types of specialists and the general practitioners. Then there are the osteopaths and the chiropractors. The qualifications and training required to practice in the different groups vary widely. After his high-school course the

specialist will have spent ten or more years in academic, professional, and interne training. It is not surprising that he rates rather low professionally the chiropractor, who has acquired his technical training in about as many months. In fact, standing among professional men themselves is likely to be rated largely according to the standards of training which have been met.

Nothing would help to break down the antipathy among the various medical schools so quickly as to have these short-term courses abolished and the thoroughness of training required in the various branches equalized. The excellent theories underlying both osteopathy and chiropractic and the many successful treatments rendered by both would then be recognized by the other professions, which are now inclined to ignore or discredit everything connected with these methods of treatment. Raise the standards of professional training and professional recognition will follow.

This prejudice existing among the professions devoted to curing physical ills has a near analogy in the church leadership professions. Many so-called directors have been trained by short-term courses in method and organization, with no adequate grounding in such studies as are basic in a divinity course. Many directors have been turned out supposedly professionally trained with simply

the A.B. degree, on which twenty-four or thirty hours of religious education have been applied. Probably it must be granted that some would-be medical doctors have hesitated at the long, expensive, and exacting technical training required and have found in osteopathy or chiropractic a a shorter, cheaper, easier way to prepare for a closely allied service. They have probably come in the process to feel that this service is quite superior to what they could have rendered as a result of the long arduous M.D. course. Probably there are numerous would-be ministers who have hesitated at the long, expensive, and exacting training required and have found in religious education a shorter, cheaper, easier way to prepare for a closely allied service. They, too, their background being what it is, may have come to feel that this service is superior to what they could have rendered as a result of the long, arduous B.D. course. In the one case as in the other it is not surprising that the upstart profession with such low standards of preparation has aroused the contempt and the opposition of those who have paid the price of a real professional training.

The analogy is suggested to emphasize the fact that if the new profession is to gain recognition and a coöperative relationship from the older profession, its standards of preparation must become

equivalent. As a cheap and easy cure-all, religious education will never be received into the church willingly by its professional leaders, the ministry.

Academically the training of the director must be such that he will merit the pastor's confidence and respect. He might rank as an assistant with somewhat inferior academic standing. He could scarcely rank as a colleague with real professional standing unless the pastor were to make some allowances. Also the director must merit the respect of other educators in the church and community. Those of the educational profession in his congregation will be among his most valuable potential leaders, and their effective service will be made far more likely if they can look up to him as a guide into relationship with the public schools in week-day religious education. The way is made much easier and the confidence and coöperation of public-school men much more likely if they can look to him as an educator with real standing.

The director needs a good background in general church administration and method. It is not enough to understand educational agencies and programs as such. The ideal of placing the total church on an educational basis involves an equally thorough grasp of the church itself as an institution. Church history, church polity, and church

management are essential preparation for effective religious educational leadership.

It has sometimes been an assumption, judging by the planning of religious educational training, that the work of the director is all concerned with methods, techniques, and organizational machinery, and not with the "content" of religious education. But the director is as much concerned with the "what" of religious education as he is with the "how." Broadly speaking they cannot be separated. Method and curriculum both reduce to the form of pupil experience when the vital learning process gets under way. Yet the meaning and interpretation of that experience is fully as significant as the method by which it is stimulated and conditioned, if not even more significant.

It is as important, therefore, that the content studies form a part of the director's training as that they enter into that of the pastor. This will call for as thorough work in Biblical, theological, philosophical, and ecclesiastical fields for the one as for the other. To be sure, the director is not intending to preach. But is the selection, organization, and guidance of a highly complicated curriculum of Christian education a less exacting task from the content standpoint than the preparation of weekly sermons? It is true that the director depends more upon printed materials than the

minister is supposed to, and yet if his teachers have the guidance and rich resource materials they will need, the range of sources in Bible, history, general literature, and the fine arts upon which the director must be able to draw are much wider than most ministers will need to use for sermonizing.

It may be true that the ordinary theological or divinity course is loaded with traditional impedimenta which are largely valueless to the modern church leader. If so, these things should be eliminated for director and minister alike, in order that both may have more time for the essentials of an adequate preparation for the extremely complex and difficult task of organizing and leading a modern church program. With such reconstruction of the content courses in the seminary curriculum as is needed for the good of the minister, this same content curriculum seems equally essential to the director.

To meet the current criticism that directors are theoretical and impractical and overtechnical, the director's preparation must include many practical case studies and sufficient first-hand experience to enable him to take hold of actual problems and situations in a common-sense manner.

In short, the academic training of the director should equal that of the minister, both in scope and content, and in addition should include somewhat

more emphasis in the field of religious education.

It should be said, however, that there is intense need of a complete reconstruction of the content and method of the theological seminary curriculum, making its method soundly educational and making its content cover the administration of a total church program educationally organized. The wholesome tendency will be, therefore, toward a seminary curriculum which in the main is the same for prospective minister and prospective director, since it should deal with the total modern church program. There will be some specialization for the minister in homiletics and sermonizing. There will be some specialization for the director in the more advanced educational techniques such as tests and measurements, fine arts, and supervision.

The development of schools of religious education apart from seminaries is to be lamented since it separates during their years of preparation two professional groups which cannot possibly be kept separate afterward. The separate school of religious education was made necessary by the inertia of the seminary in responding to an intense new need. It is to be hoped that the future will witness the development of a new type of seminary curriculum, to prepare leaders for the new type of church —the church as a school in Christian living. This new type of seminary will use the laboratory and

apprentice methods long used by other professional training schools and will produce graduates skilled in church administration rather than novices who have to learn most of their practical leadership methods in the hard school of unguided experience after the seminary has turned them loose.

A few years of pastoral experience form a most valuable part of the director's training. He will gain a general church viewpoint, sympathy with the pastoral work and responsibility, and an opportunity for valuable experimentation in organizing the total church program educationally. Also his pastoral colleague will have greater confidence in his ability to see the whole church program and to grasp the pastor's viewpoint.

An apprenticeship, or "interneship" as it is called in the medical profession, would be highly valuable training before the full responsibilities of a directorship are assumed. The director who has not had such experience ought to be very careful to avoid cocksureness and overconfidence as he undertakes his work. Particularly should he be amenable to the counsel and guidance of his pastor.

High as are the standards of personal qualifications and training which we have suggested, the director who measures up to them will still need to give the most careful attention to his own personal and professional growth. This is true of all educa-

tional leadership. Paradoxical as it may seem, the educational profession is probably more blighted by inertia and stagnation than is any other. Many schools of education daily demonstrate in their own classrooms most of the pedagogical blunders and errors against which their students are warned. This failure to experience the growth which is continually expected in others must be feared especially by the religious educator. It is possible to become professionally so familiar with spiritual processes that they are all viewed with cold objectivity as part of the day's work. Above all else the director must himself experience that growth which he seeks to stimulate and condition in others.

It is a mistaken notion that the work of the director is less "spiritual" than that of the pastor. His personal influence over the staff will largely determine the spiritual tone of the whole Church School. The pastor's influence should definitely reënforce the director's in this respect, yet the relationship of counselor and supervisor which the director bears to the staff makes a red-blooded, vital religious experience on his part an absolute necessity. Furthermore the director needs to share in the pastoral contacts in homes and personal contacts generally and should be a center of radiant Christian influence.

The maintenance of a vital, personal religious

experience and growth on the part of the director is of supreme importance. The vast number and complexity of the responsibilities which fall upon his shoulders and the continual drag of our materialistic social order will make this very difficult. He needs to face it as one of those major conditions of success which cannot be ignored or treated lightly.

There are of course wide differences of personality and temperament which preclude the laying down of any hard and fast rules by which personal spiritual growth may be insured. There are various methods of personal religious experience of varying values to different individuals. The educational viewpoint does not preclude nor disparage mysticism. Neither does it exalt rationalism. It does insist upon the wholeness of experience and poise of personality which interpret religious experience as coextensive with all activities which are undertaken with religious motives and carried through religious devotion.

In the main, therefore, the director will find the source of his religious growth not in activities which are apart from his duties as a religious leader but rather as an integral aspect of those duties. A conference with a teacher over a problem of cooperation in the work of the department may be a deep religious experience for the director as well

as for the teacher. A call in the home of a delinquent pupil may be a rich experience of sharing and helping to solve the problems of parenthood. The rejoicing over the fine fruitage of a successful series of worship programs may be rich in its resources for new morale. Within the Church School program itself are the means of spiritual growth and power if routine can be kept subordinate to deep religious purpose. No activity of the director need be commonplace if it be undertaken in a spirit which is not commonplace. The shoemaker of India who made "every pair of shoes as though they were for Jesus," has discovered for us the source of spiritual growth in the daily routine. Not only in moments of private devotions but in many social contacts are the sources of religious insight and growth.

Accompanying the spiritual growth of the director must be continuous professional growth. A program developing and changing as rapidly as is the program of religious education will move off and leave the director who is not continually studying, however adequate his technical training may be.

The director's library will be one of his chief instruments of professional growth as well as of the training of others. Magazines, books, pictures, and curricular materials, all of which are being

produced to-day in such profusion, will be continually flowing into this library to be evaluated, classified, displayed, and used. For director and staff this will be a workshop. To make adequate use of it, a reading schedule must be maintained and the director must guard his time for this as carefully as the pastor guards his time for the preparation of sermons. The product of the director's study is not so direct and concrete as is that of the pastor's but it is fully as important in its general and indirect outcome. The fact that it is less specific makes the guarding of the director's study time all the more difficult and necessary.

Reading alone is neither the most efficient nor the most reliable way to keep abreast of developments. Summer leadership schools, summer terms at universities, courses in the Advanced Leadership Curriculum, and even correspondence study, if other means are not possible, are additional ways of continuing professional growth.

Of equal importance are professional contacts. The annual meeting of the International Council of Religious Education, in which there is a Directors' Professional Advisory Section, the conventions of the Religious Education Association, and conventions and institutes in which professional contacts are available, all have an indispensable contribution to make to the director's professional

growth and efficiency. Because of the newness of the profession, the rapid developments under way in the program, and the necessity for a wide exchange of experiences in stabilizing the movement, such contacts are even more important for the director than for the pastor.

In cities where there are a number of directors, they sometimes form an association corresponding somewhat to the ministerial alliance or association. Perhaps if they could form as a section of the ministers' organization it might serve the purpose equally well and provide also a desirable additional contact. The profession is greatly in need of making the most of all such opportunities for growth and interchange of experience.

It might be assumed from the use of the masculine pronoun throughout the preceding treatment and the angle from which the various functions and relationships have been discussed that masculinity is an essential qualification of the director of religious education. On the contrary there are a great many women directors and not a few examples of fine educational leadership are to be found among them.

Women have not yet entered the regular ministry to any significant extent, and it is likely that this venerable profession will remain in the possession of men for many generations to come. The new

profession of religious education, however, has no such traditions and quite readily lends itself to either sex. The fact that the public-school teaching staff has become so largely feminized makes it seem natural for women to enter the religious educational field. There has always been the same fine Christian idealism among young women as among young men, the same longing to dedicate life to full-time Christian service. With the ministry largely closed to them, mission work and social service have been about the only professional avenues open. With the development of the new profession of religious education, quite naturally many young women saw a fine opportunity for a vocation of Christian service. No discussion of the profession is adequate which does not take into account the large proportion of women engaged in it.

As is not the case with some others of the religious vocations open to women, the profession of religious educational director seems to have certain advantages.

It has been taken for granted in this discussion that the director's salary should be equivalent to that of the pastor, provided the qualifications are as high. However, this represents the ideal rather than the reality for actually the salary scale of directors is much below that of ministers in the same

churches. This is due in part to the fact that there is, at least from the standpoint of the congregation, a corresponding difference in qualifications. But it is also due to the lower evaluation or appreciation which the congregation places upon the work of the director. His is considered the less essential function—perhaps even something of an ecclesiastical luxury. Therefore it would be impossible to put his service in the budget in the same terms as the pastor's even though he were equally qualified. The director's standard of living must not fall much below that of the pastor and he is likely to have fully as expensive a family to support. To serve as a director rather than as a pastor usually means, therefore, that a man and his family pay a real price in sacrifice.

There are several reasons why a woman may serve as director at little or no financial sacrifice. Normally a man director will have a family to support, while normally a woman director will not. The other positions open to a woman in Christian service will likely be no more lucrative than religious education since the regular ministry is seldom an alternative for her. While there is no disposition here to justify paying a woman less than a man for equivalent service, remuneration in church vocations has always been based more upon the actual requirements of the worker for a livelihood

than upon the fair rewards of service rendered. Because of the inevitable limitations of the finances available for religious education and the possibility that women will render the service more cheaply than men, the profession will probably continue to be fairly divided between the sexes, if indeed women do not predominate in numbers.

The fact that the Church School staff is largely feminine, and that so much of the director's supervisory responsibility concerns the Elementary Division, may give a woman director some advantages. At least it is far more common to find a woman as a specialist in the field of Children's Work than to find a man. In cases where the pastor is educationally qualified to give general direction and supervision to the Church School but needs assistance because of the total volume of his work, a specialist in Children's Work may be a better means of meeting the need than a general director of religious education. This must not, however, shut the pastor out of continuous contacts with the children of his parish. There are many situations where the contribution which can be made by a woman will be as great or greater than that of a man of equal ability, due to the nature of the work which is needed.

Generally speaking the problems of adjustment between pastor and director have been less obtru-

sive and difficult in the case of women directors than with men. Women have been much less sensitive than men in the matter of rank and prerogatives. There has been no aspiration toward pulpit work, which has sometimes aroused antipathy between men. The kind of leadership a woman exerts is somewhat different from that of the pastor and there is less likelihood of uneasiness or jealousy on the part of the minister. There has been less cause for apprehension that a general reconstruction of the church's program might center it around a leader other than the pastor. On the whole a well-qualified woman is more likely than a man of equal qualifications to be willing to take a position in the whole program which is satisfactory to the pastor. Ministers who have worked with men as directors have sometimes expressed themselves as decidedly against trying another man director but quite willing to have a woman. The attitudes of ministers will likely make openings in the future more plentiful for women than for men.

Of course a woman director is at some disadvantage. In her contacts with church officers and the general adult congregation the fact that she is a woman usually gives her less professional prestige. The fact that she is less likely to occupy the pulpit and make other public speaking engagements than a man means the loss of valuable

opportunities to promote and popularize the program. She may escape some problems normal to the man director and at the same time forfeit some of the great assets which he has. On the whole the woman director will probably hold a position and a relationship slightly different from those of a man, but the advantages about offset the disadvantages.

Assuming that there will be some differences here and there in the functions and relationships assumed by a woman director, the foregoing treatment applies about as aptly to the woman director as to the man. The goals, the principles, and the methods will be practically the same.

It is clear that the woman director, to be successful in achieving that position of prestige and recognition in the congregation which will be necessary to insure her leadership in putting over the requisite changes, will require an exceptionally forceful and winsome personality. Young women who do not naturally achieve positions of leadership and influence in their college life and church groups, ought to choose vocations which are less exacting in this respect than that of director. Probably more young women aspiring to this position have been disappointed because of lack of forceful and dynamic personality than because of lack of academic training.

The training required for a woman is little different from that for a man. No part of her preparation is more essential than the general divinity course. The great need of the profession, whether it be entered by men or by women, is for a type of personnel natively qualified, academically trained, and practically experienced to give the church a leadership in this exacting and complex function comparable with any leadership which it has for any function.

CHAPTER IX

Educational Leadership in the Smaller Church

PROBABLY the great majority of churches which believe sufficiently in the educational program to desire a technically trained professional leader for it are unable financially to secure such a leader. At least they desire to make other expenditures sufficient to preclude adequate financial support for a director.

In some cases this has led to a combination of directorship with some other function, the two together justifying the outlay for one salary. The result is a combined director of education and of music, or a combined director of education and financial secretary or business manager, or a combined director of education and church secretary.

Whether such combinations are sound in principle of course depends upon how effective the work which results really is. In some cases there has certainly been a tendency for the educational function to be crowded out. The duties in the other field are so much more clearly understood and expected and the results so much more immediately

obvious that the educational function is in danger of neglect. It is always a question whether a person can be equally interested in two rather distinct functions. Perhaps the failure of combinations has been due to the fact that such persons are frequently something else than educators.

Music plays such a large part in the educational program that the combination here is less objectionable. However, there is no more reason, if indeed as much, for combining the duties of educational director and music director than those of pastor and music director. In short, there is no objection to combining any of these functions with the pastorate which is not equally valid against combining it with the duties of the director. At best such combinations are likely to be makeshifts in one or the other function, and possibly in both. However, a student with musical ability who is preparing to be a director will do well to cultivate his leadership ability in music for it will be a real asset.

The small or medium-sized church which is unable to employ a full-time director is apparently left in a bad plight if the educational function is as important as we insist that it is. The ultimate solution of this problem is to be found in a new type of pastor. This solution escapes many of the problems dealt with in the foregoing pages which arise out of a dual leadership. The new type of

pastor will approach his leadership responsibility from the standpoint of a new definition of the nature and scope of his functions, the basic method to be used, and the very character of the church itself.

Such a pastor will conceive of his responsibility as including the religious needs and development of childhood and youth just as much as of adults. In view of the fact that these needs cannot be met simply by a pulpit ministry but require a comprehensive religious educational program, the provision and direction of that program will be undertaken by the pastor with the same care and preparation as is the provision of a pulpit ministry. Instead of looking to a Sunday School and a number of other auxiliary agencies under voluntary and largely untrained leadership to take over this responsibility, the pastor will set about the organization of the church itself into a school in Christian living. As the employed professional leader of the congregation he will no more think of placing full responsibility for the educational ministry to all age groups upon the shoulders of laymen than he would think of placing responsibility for the pulpit ministry there. He will consider the one function fully as important as the other and certainly as dependent upon professional training and employed leadership.

Because the traditional pastorate has been so restricted in its functions both as to method and as to scope of age groups for which responsibility was assumed, this new type of pastor will probably find it desirable for a time to have his congregation apply a dual title to him. Some prefer the title of "pastor-director" and some that of "educational pastor." It is not likely that the pastor can get quite the position of leadership which he should have and the opportunity to exert a directing hand in reconstructing the total program for educational purposes without specific recognition on the part of the congregation of this full dual responsibility.

The pastor-director will find in the foregoing pages much of the guidance needed as to his full functions. With the exception of the discussions dealing with the relationships between joint professional leaders of a congregation, the suggestions given apply equally to the pastor-director and to the director. The functions which have been discussed, plus preaching and additional pastoral work, will make up the job analysis of the pastor-director.

Obviously if the pastor is to assume this educational leadership in addition to traditional functions of the ministry it will be necessary to limit those traditional functions or to assign some of them to voluntary workers. The development of a

thoroughgoing educational program will carry some of them and render others unnecessary.

A rich educational program will create many program features which will lighten the preaching load. Projects of dramatization and pageantry; pupil-directed worship and discussion or forum programs; and exhibits, demonstrations, and study classes will probably entirely replace the Sunday evening sermon.

One pastor has satisfactorily solved the problem of the evening service (and it is a problem with most pastors) by the following program. From seven to seven thirty a vesper worship service is conducted by some one of the young people's groups. Occasionally there is a brief address by a visitor. Usually, however, there is simply a worship program planned and led entirely by student groups. Then from seven thirty to eight thirty, five discussion groups meet, providing a graded program for adolescents and adults. The pastor often participates in one of the discussion groups. He acts as counselor in planning the worship programs, but assumes no further responsibility. He has only one sermon a week to prepare. In interest, attendance, and evidence of fruitfulness, this type of evening program is an improvement over the preaching service which it superseded.

Even though the minister carries major respon-

sibility for the evening service it is unlikely that the preaching of a second sermon is the best use to make of it. If the morning sermon be thought-provoking, dealing with real issues of Christian living, it is probable that the evening hour may be more profitably used in a forum discussion of this sermon than in listening to another. Listening to sermons is not, after all, the most effective learning method. Is there not sufficient intelligence in the pew to-day so that it should occasionally answer back, or at least ask questions? By stimulating preaching in the morning and the give and take of creative discussion on the same theme in the evening, congregational thinking and attitudes may be more deeply influenced than by two sermons a day.

The pastor-director will find the occasion, the theme, and the subject matter for much of his preaching right in the educational program itself. The reading, conferences, and thinking required for effective educational leadership will furnish the background of much fruitful preaching. In fact, the pastor-director will increasingly find his pulpit ministry and his educational ministry so supplementing each other that they tend to merge into one.

Much of the pastoral work also will combine the educational with the pastoral function. As the educational program becomes increasingly fruit-

ful it will become the chief means of securing regular church attendance and participation, financial support, recruitment of church members, and influence in the community at large. Much of the pastor's effort is directed to these ends. If he can accomplish them even more efficiently by organizing and directing a rich educational program, then he has not increased his burdens but simply discovered a more skillful way of carrying them.

It is the very genius of educational leadership to enlist the services of the largest possible number of people. The pastor-director will give much attention to a program for the development and training of an adequate staff of lay leaders. Such a staff multiplies his own personality, since he projects himself through it. Here again, assuming educational responsibility adds not to his burdens but to the number sharing them. It should be clear that there is a great difference between a pastor's turning over all educational responsibility to a lay leadership and a pastor's carrying this responsibility himself but developing leaders who share it with him. The pastor-director is not a pastor who has loaded himself with a multitude of new and burdensome duties. He is a pastor who has prepared himself to lead a total church program and is master of an effective method by which it can be done.

If a pastor is to become pastor-director, carrying out the functions which have been described in the foregoing pages, it is evident that special preparation will be required. The ordinary pastor could do no more tragic or foolish thing than to get himself labeled pastor-director and forthwith take control of his Sunday School and other agencies. Quite likely he would displace leaders better qualified than himself. Through reading, training courses, conferences, and professional contacts he will need to make careful preparation for these exacting responsibilities. The day will come when the seminaries will realize that they have been for years training ministers to lead and perpetuate an obsolete and pitifully impotent church program. In time we may hope for a generation of pastors qualified for this full church leadership. In the meantime some of those now in service will prepare themselves for the larger function. But thousands of churches, too small or financially weak to employ directors, will be served by pastors unable to move far out of the traditional grooves. What can such churches do to secure the advantages of technically trained educational leadership? Several plans for a coöperative approach are successfully under way.

One such plan is that of the denominational district or city director. The several churches of a

given denomination in a limited area pool the financial resources available for the purpose and employ a director who divides time among them. Necessarily such a director will have to make some adaptations in the way in which he carries on the necessary functions. Much of the work will be of the conference type and will be done in the evenings.

The director's first approach in each church will probably be the introduction of the standard or program of work. This will set the local workers to a survey of their church from the educational standpoint and will result in the setting of definite goals for improvement. Counsel and help in deciding upon these needed improvements and in carrying them through will be one of the director's important contributions.

Workers' conferences will offer the director effective monthly contacts with the leadership. These conferences may well come even more frequently than once a month. In these conferences the progress on the standard will be reported and evaluated, problems of administration and policy will be discussed, and some educational feature will be provided which will build up the educational background and appreciation of the workers.

The director will of course spend Sunday in one of the churches, observing the program and giving

as much counsel and help as possible. These observations will be his means of checking on the reported gains made according to the standard, and an important factor in the program of counseling.

One of the most effective services will be a program of leadership training. The director will teach many of the classes himself. Perhaps twice a year he will set up a six weeks' school, or class, held one night each week in each church. If the churches are sufficiently close together the students from two or more of the churches may be combined in some of these classes. In addition, the director will stimulate and supervise the holding of local classes under the best available leadership in each church. Of course all opportunities for participation in community training enterprises will be used to the full. In each church the director will seek to set up a leadership training program which will take advantage of all available facilities and undertake to prepare a qualified staff both for present and for prospective service.

The district director will carry out as fully as possible the supervisory functions. Since the staffs in these small churches will be smaller than those in a large church this will not necessarily mean an impossible task. The contact with the workers will be less continuous, and the progress in their self-improvement possibly somewhat

slower, but this does not preclude very definite supervisory achievements. The techniques will not be different from those used by the local church director.

The relationships of the district director with the several pastors are a matter of great importance. The less continuous contacts which the district director is able to maintain with each local church make even more necessary the coöperation of the pastors in carrying out policies. A very definite understanding of these coöperative responsibilities and relationships is essential at the outset. Unless such coöperation can be assured there is little use in undertaking to serve a given church. Much the same may be said of the general superintendent of the Church School and other prominent lay leaders.

It is evident that the number of churches which can be effectively served by one director is decidedly limited. Probably five or six is about the maximum. Their size and proximity will be factors in determining the number, and also the attitudes and abilities of their leadership, both pastoral and lay.

A slightly different plan for bringing a group of churches into coöperation in the employment of an educational director is for several churches of various denominations in a community to employ a single director. The launching of a program of

week-day religious education on the coöperative basis is sometimes the occasion for doing this. It might, however, be done very advantageously even though a coöperative Week Day Church School were not immediately involved.

It would not be necessary for all the churches of a community to participate in such a plan, even though it might be desirable. Those churches which wished to assume a share of the financial responsibility and to share in the service would do so voluntarily, with no reflection upon those who did not wish so to participate.

The director might sustain a personal relationship with each of the church boards or educational councils, their joint action being required only in financing the enterprise. It would be much better, however, to organize a joint board or council of education, each church participating being officially represented upon it. The director would carry on activities affecting the churches as a whole under the supervision of this board. Services rendered in the local churches as such might still simply bring the director into personal relations with the respective local church boards or councils. These relationships and functions would not be essentially different from those of the denominational district director already discussed.

There are decided advantages to this community

plan from the director's standpoint. The churches will probably be much nearer together than if they were all of one denomination. They will probably constitute a predominant religious influence in a definite community. This will make possible the carrying out of many joint or community enterprises under the direct supervision of the joint council.

Week-day religious education has already been mentioned as one likely coöperative enterprise. International Standard Leadership Training Schools would be another worthy joint project. A community survey to discover and enlist new students and to chart unmet needs could be undertaken. Community Vacation Church Schools would also be a worth-while enterprise. In many ways the director would become a real force in the community, bridging denominational chasms and developing community spirit. There is scarcely a more challenging opportunity for spiritual leadership.

To be sure, the community director faces certain problems. The relationship to denominational overheads is somewhat complicated. Some try to exert much closer supervision over local churches than do others. The programs and curricular materials projected from the various overheads and publishers vary, and require more effort on the part of the director in mastering them. There is,

however, a compensating richness in this variety. Then denominational loyalty is sometimes a stronger motive than community loyalty and the director may have a delicate problem in keeping all groups actively coöperating. The most wholesome situation would be to have more churches desirous of entering the council to secure the director's service and share the expense than were needed or could be adequately served. This would make coöperation a privilege to be surrendered when no longer fully appreciated and lived up to. On the whole this plan has large possibilities.

Another effective plan in which denominational interests and coöperative values were both conserved is that being carried out in Tompkins County, New York.

A religious survey of this county conducted by Professor Ralph A. Felton revealed the fact that a large majority of the population of this county was unreached by religious institutions, though there were many churches. Professor Felton's own report of the continuation of the study and the solution reached is illuminating. We quote from his report to the Superintendent of Leadership Training of the New York Sunday School Association:

> We next made a study of the strength of the denominations. The Episcopal church in the city had

600 members; the five Episcopal churches in the county had 263 members. One of the Methodist churches in the city, which had only one pastor to support and only one building to keep up, had 1460 members. Twenty-three Methodist churches in the county had thirteen pastors to support and twenty-three buildings to keep up but had only 1570 members to do it. In other words we felt that the city churches had a responsible debt to the rural churches of their denomination. This was more true because most of the officers of the city churches have moved in from the country. We first asked the city Methodist church to provide a director of religious education. They voted to do this; that is, to allocate a part of their missionary funds for this expenditure. The Presbyterian church of the city was next asked to employ a director of religious education; the Baptist church was third; and the Episcopal church, fourth. The Methodist director is paid by the First Methodist Church of Ithaca out of their World Service Gifts. The Presbyterian rural director is paid by the Presbyterian church as an extra item in their budget. The Baptist director is paid by a rural Baptist church, which gives to her what they used to give to their pastor. Her salary is also supplemented by four Baptist churches in the association. The Episcopal director who comes this fall will receive half from the city church and half from the diocese. The first three directors give all their time to rural work. The Episcopal director gives half her time to the city parish. The county is divided into four parts and each of the directors has complete responsibility for religious education in her quarter of the county. In addition to that, they serve as specialists in our County

Council: the Methodist being the Primary specialist; the Baptist, the Vacation Church School specialist; and the Presbyterian, a specialist in Young People's Work. We expect to ask the Episcopal worker to become superintendent of Leadership Training.

I think that if our work in this county has any distinction it is in the following points: (1) We are asking our city churches to finance our religious education program in a large measure. (2) We are raising the money for our workers from denominational rather than from interdenominational channels. We find it easier to get $1000 for denominational work than $100 for interdenominational. (3) Each denominational worker, while employed by her denomination and reporting to her denomination, does interdenominational work entirely. The denominations seem to be proud of the fact that they are furnishing a person for interdenominational work. (4) We have tried to attempt a few big things rather than to attempt a lot of little things. For example, we are having a vesper service each Sunday afternoon during the months of July and August, under the auspices of our County Council of Religious Education. Last Sunday we had 1000 people present. We had a county musical festival on May 19, in which our schools, Sunday Schools, and church choirs competed. We had 1000 people take part in this festival.

We have received all our inspiration and help during the last two years from the Leadership Training Department of our State Sunday School Association. I doubt if it is generally known how much of an impetus our State Sunday School Association gives to this type of work in a quiet, careful, and unheralded manner. This last year we started week-

day religious education in our city schools and beginning September 4 we employ our fifth director, who will give all her time to the week-day religious education in our city schools. Our budget in two years has increased from $300 to $7000. Last year we had week-day religious education classes in 66 schools in the county and 17 classes a week in the city. Last summer we had Vacation Schools in 31 communities, all of them interdenominational schools. Fifty churches coöperated. Our attendance at the Vacation Schools in 1925 was 40 pupils; in 1926, 450; in 1927, 1300. Last summer we used 178 volunteer teachers in our Vacation School program. Our schools for this summer are not completed, but will be larger. Two years ago we had a Vacation School in a most neglected community and had an enrollment of 25 pupils. This year's school in that same community closed Friday with an enrollment of 53 pupils.

As a result of this county-wide program the churches in two communities have federated, or rather worked out a coöperative program. One larger parish has been organized and another is in the process of organization. In one charge there were 100 children more in Sunday School than were in the Sunday Schools of that charge a year ago.

In another church that had 5 Young People a year ago there are now 42 members in the Young People's Class. I think that increase in numbers is not the important thing about our work but rather the changed attitude of the people of our county toward religious education.

We come now to a possible solution for one problem which is vexing state councils of religious

education, that of revitalizing the old county Sunday School associations while at the same time providing educational assistance for the smaller church.

The old state Sunday School association was built almost entirely on support received from county associations; these in turn were supported by district associations, which in turn brought a group of churches in a locality into coöperation. The program was "piped down" from the International Association to the state associations, by them to county associations, and in turn to district associations, which carried the plans into local churches. Below the level of the state office practically all the personnel was voluntary. Usually, however, it represented the best available. Naturally what was handed down through such a circuitous and voluntary route must be very simple.

The "program" consisted of a "ten point" standard, organizational and promotional rather than educational; suggested reading courses; a system of annual conventions on each level; and a system of reports gathered from the local church and passed up from level to level on prepared blanks.

In the days before leadership training, and before there were any denominational field staffs and educational programs to speak of, it was possible for these district and county officers, in promoting

the standards, gathering the reports, and setting up the conventions to render some real service of inspiration and guidance to local Sunday Schools. The association machinery was supported because it really did seem to be doing much good and it was not costly because most of its work was voluntarily contributed. This elaborate system of district and county associations supported state associations with a personnel which, while not technically trained, because there really was no science of religious education, stimulated much interest in Sunday School work and started many new schools.

Then the denominations awakened to the tremendous resources of religious education, which was beginning to develop into a real science. National boards were created, projecting field programs carried by a well trained personnel. Educational standards were erected. Leadership training was started on a wide and thorough scale. Soon the great majority of local Church Schools were being reached directly, through denominational channels, with a program and supervisory leadership quite superior to those of the old associational machinery.

The old machinery continued, however, with about the same quality of leadership that it had always had. "County children's superintendents" and "district young people's superintendents" when

they sought to carry the old associational program into local churches found already there a denominational program and a local school leadership moderately trained to carry it out. The county and district officers with all their fine devotion were not very warmly received because there was now little that they could contribute to local school leadership. Through the help which it received by way of denominational channels the local school moved on ahead of even the ideals of the old associational organization. Usually the choicest leadership became tied up in local work and the old associational machinery kept on turning with no grist to grind. Naturally as interest waned financial support waned likewise. Many county associations went to pieces entirely. Hence the financial depression of the overheads which depended upon them for support.

All this does not mean that denominationalism has crushed out coöperative religious education. It does mean that the old coöperative program failed to keep abreast in its leadership and its educational ideals with denominational developments. It was not because it was a coöperative program, but because it was an obsolete program, that it went to the wall.

But the new soundly educational program of Church School work, by reason of the very fact that

it requires professionally trained and employed local Church School supervision, demands a great new coöperative set-up. This new plan will not be a paper organization handed down from above. It will be developed out of the dire needs of local churches who come together for the securing of educational direction for their own programs, not merely to project a form of organization. We have already suggested the pattern for this type of council with its technically trained and employed executive secretary and supervisor. With the amount of trained leadership and denominational supervision available in local churches to-day there is no place for voluntary untrained county and district superintendents. There is a great place for a coöperatively employed specialist.

We may, therefore, encourage the rapid spread of local councils of religious education comprised of churches voluntarily committing themselves and their resources to a coöperative program. The employed workers must be such as can come into local churches and render genuine help in counseling and leadership training. They must be willing to carry forward denominational programs and interests in the respective churches. They must be genuinely interdenominational with no pretense at being nondenominational and no aspirations at being superdenominational. This is not to enthrone

denominationalism but simply to recognize the actual situation with regard to local church organization. The most effective way to bring churches into coöperative relationships is to recognize them as churches.

When such interchurch councils are set up it is highly desirable that the resources of the community for religious education be pooled so far as possible. A church which has a full-time director, or a pastor-director, should be eager to participate both in the privileges and in the obligations of such a community council.

The reason for this full discussion of the obsolete local coöperative machinery is to point out the fact that here rather than in the individual local church probably lies the largest field of expansion for the religious education profession as such. The large community interests involved in a complete program of religious education and the many tasks which can be better done coöperatively make this a most promising field for persons of high qualifications.

The potential results of an adequately supervised educational program in every local church are such as to justify, in fact to demand, that every church have such. Modern civilization cannot afford the spiritual waste resulting from unskillful and inefficient religious education. A way must

be found by which every growing person will have access to a Church School whose program is worthy of our day. This requires professional supervision in each local church. Through the director of religious education, the pastor-director, or the interchurch director, this need must be met. To fail is for our generation to commit spiritual suicide.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chapter I

Betts, George H., *"The New Program of Religious Education."* Abingdon Press, New York, 1921.

Brown, Arlo A., *"A History of Religious Education in Recent Times."* Abingdon Press, New York, 1923.

Bower, W. C., *"Religious Education in the Modern Church."* Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

Coe, George A., *"What Is Christian Education?"* Chapters 1, 3, 7. Scribner, New York, 1929.

Jerusalem Meeting International Missionary Council, Vol. II, Religious Education, Chapters 1, 7. International Missionary Council, 1928.

Kilpatrick, William Heard, *"Education for a Changing Civilization."* Macmillan, New York, 1927.

Munro, Harry C., *"The Church as a School,"* Chapter 1. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

Munro, Harry C., *"The Pastor and Religious Education,"* Chapters 1, 6. Abingdon Press, New York, 1930.

"The Teaching Work of the Church," Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, Part I. Association Press, New York, 1923.

Vieth, Paul H., *"Teaching for Christian Living."* Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

Vieth, Paul H., *"Improving Your Sunday School."* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1930.

Watson, Goodwin B., *"Experimentation and Measurement in Religious Education,"* Chapter 1. Association Press, New York, 1927.

CHAPTER II

MUNRO, HARRY C., "*The Church as a School,*" Chapter 12. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

MUNRO, HARRY C., "*The Pastor and Religious Education,*" Chapter 7. Abingdon Press, New York, 1930.

RESEARCH SERVICE BULLETIN NO. 3-4, "*Personnel and Work of Director of Religious Education,*" Sections 1, 7. International Council of Religious Education, 1926.

CHAPTER III

BEAVEN, A. W., "*Putting the Church on a Full Time Basis,*" Part I. Doubleday, Doran, New York, 1928.

BETTS, GEORGE H., "*The New Program of Religious Education.*" Abingdon Press, New York, 1921.

BOWER, W. C., "*Religious Education in the Modern Church,*" Chapters 1, 2. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

COE, GEORGE A., "*What Is Christian Education?*" Chapters 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11. Scribner, New York, 1929.

COPE, HENRY F., "*Organizing the Church School.*" Doubleday, Doran, New York, 1923.

FISKE, GEORGE WALTER, "*Purpose in Teaching Religion,*" Part I. Abingdon Press, New York, 1927.

HARPER, W. A., "*An Integrated Program of Religious Education.*" Macmillan, New York, 1926.

JERUSALEM MEETING INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL, Vol. II., Religious Education, Chapter 7. International Missionary Council, 1928.

KILPATRICK, WILLIAM HEARD, "*Education for a Changing Civilization.*" Macmillan, New York, 1927.

McAfee, Cleland B., "*The Christian Message and Program,*" Chapters 9, 10, 11. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1929.

Munro, Harry C., "*The Church as a School,*" Chapters 2, 3, 4, 11. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

Munro, Harry C., "*The Pastor and Religious Education,*" Chapters 4, 5, 9. Abingdon Press, New York, 1930.

Myers, A. J. W., "*Teaching Religion,*" Chapter 5. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1929.

Research Service Bulletin No. 3-4, "*Personnel and Work of Director of Religious Education,*" Section 4. International Council of Religious Education, 1926.

Soares, Theodore G., "*Religious Education,*" Chapters 6, 13. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1928.

Stock, Harry T., "*Church Work with Young People.*" Pilgrim Press, Boston, 1928.

"*The Teaching Work of the Church,*" Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, Preface, Part II. Association Press, New York, 1923.

Vieth, Paul H., "*Teaching for Christian Living,*" Chapter 2. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

Vieth, Paul H., "*Objectives in Religious Education.*" Harpers, New York, 1930.

Chapter IV

Beaven, A. W., "*Putting the Church on a Full Time Basis,*" Part I. Doubleday, Doran, New York, 1928.

Betts, G. H., and Hawthorne, M. O., "*Method in Teaching Religion,*" Chapter 3. Abingdon Press, New York, 1925.

BETTS, GEORGE H., "*The New Program of Religious Education.*" Abingdon Press, New York, 1921.

BOWER, W. C., "A Survey of Religious Education in the Modern Church," Chapters 3, 12. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

COE, GEORGE A., "*What Is Christian Education?*" Chapters 8, 9. Scribner, New York, 1929.

COPE, HENRY F., "*Organizing the Church School.*" Doubleday, Doran, New York, 1923.

CUBBERLEY, E. P., "*The Principal and His School,*" Chapters 4, 5, 9. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1923.

CUBBERLEY, E. P., "*Public School Administration,*" Chapters 8, 11. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1922.

FISKE, GEORGE WALTER, "*Purpose in Teaching Religion,*" Part II. Abingdon Press, New York, 1927.

HARPER, W. A., "*An Integrated Program of Religious Education.*" Macmillan, New York, 1926.

KILPATRICK, WILLIAM HEARD, "*Education for a Changing Civilization.*" Macmillan, New York, 1927.

MCKIBBEN, FRANK, "*The Improvement of Religious Education,*" 1930 (in preparation).

MUNRO, HARRY C., "*The Church as a School,*" Chapters 10, 11. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

RESEARCH SERVICE BULLETIN No. 3-4, "*Personnel and Work of Director of Religious Education,*" Sections 3, 4, 6. International Council of Religious Education, 1926.

"*The Teaching Work of the Church,*" Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, Part III. Association Press, New York, 1923.

VIETH, PAUL H., "*Improving Your Sunday School.*" Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1930.

Chapter V

Cope, Henry F., "*Organizing the Church School*," Chapter 5. Doubleday, Doran, New York, 1923.

Cubberley, E. P., "*Public School Administration*," Chapters 10, 13, 14. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1922.

Cubberley, E. P., "*The Principal and His School*," Chapters 10, 15. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1923.

Munro, Harry C., "*The Church as a School*," Chapters 7, 12. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

Myers, A. J. W., "*Teaching Religion*," Chapter 11. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1929.

Research Service Bulletin No. 3-4, "*Personnel and Work of Director of Religious Education*," Section 6. International Council of Religious Education, 1926.

Chapter VI

Anderson, C. J., Barr, A. S., and Bush, M. G., "*Visiting the Teacher at Work*." Appleton, New York, 1925.

Beaven, A. W., "*Putting the Church on a Full Time Basis*," Chapter 8. Doubleday, Doran, New York, 1928.

Betts, G. H., and Hawthorne, M. O., "*Method in Teaching Religion*," Chapter 10. Abingdon Press, New York, 1925.

Bower, W. C., "*A Survey of Religious Education in the Modern Church*," Chapters 4, 8. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

Burton, William H., "*Supervision and the Improvement of Teaching*." Appleton, New York, 1922.

Coe, George A., "*What Is Christian Education?*" Chapter 7. Scribner, New York, 1929.

Collings, Ellsworth, "*School Supervision in Theory and Practice*." Crowell, New York, 1927.

COPE, HENRY F., "*Organizing the Church School,*" Chapters, 5, 6, 7, 19. Doubleday, Doran, New York, 1923.

CUBBERLEY, E. P., "*The Principal and His School,*" Part IV. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1923.

CUBBERLEY, E. P., "*Public School Administration,*" Chapters 14, 15, 19. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1922.

KLYVER, FAYE HUNTINGTON, "*Supervision of Student-Teachers in Religious Education,*" Chapters 1, 6, 7, 8. Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York, 1925.

MCKIBBEN, FRANK, "*The Improvement of Religious Education,*" 1930 (in preparation).

MUNRO, HARRY C., "*The Church as a School,*" Chapters 8, 9. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

MYERS, A. J. W., "*Teaching Religion,*" Chapters 11, 12. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1929.

RESEARCH SERVICE BULLETIN NO. 3-4, "*Personnel and Work of Director of Religious Education,*" Section 6. International Council of Religious Education, 1926.

VIETH, PAUL H., "*Teaching for Christian Living,*" Chapter 10. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

VIETH, PAUL H., "*Improving Your Sunday School.*" Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1930.

WATSON, GOODWIN B., "*Experimentation and Measurement in Religious Education.*" Association Press, New York, 1927.

CHAPTER VII

MUNRO, HARRY C., "*The Church as a School,*" Chapter 12. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

RESEARCH SERVICE BULLETIN NO. 3-4, "*Personnel and Work of Director of Religious Education,*" Sections 2, 8. International Council of Religious Education, 1926.

WRIGHT, ALFRED J., "*Attitudes of the Ministry Toward the Director of Religious Education,*" Bulletin No. 24. Boston University, Boston, 1928.

CHAPTER VIII

BEAVEN, A. W., "*Putting the Church on a Full Time Basis,*" Chapter 8. Doubleday, Doran, New York, 1928.

BOWER, W. C., "*A Survey of Religious Education in the Modern Church,*" Chapter 4. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

BURTON, WILLIAM H., "*Supervision and the Improvement of Teaching,*" Part IV. Appleton, New York, 1922.

MCKIBBEN, FRANK, "*The Improvement of Religious Education,*" 1930 (in preparation).

MUNRO, HARRY C., "*The Church as a School,* Chapter 8. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1929.

RESEARCH SERVICE BULLETIN No. 3-4, "*Personnel and Work of Director of Religious Education,*" Section 5. International Council of Religious Education, 1926.

"*The Teaching Work of the Church,*" Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, Chapter 12. Association Press, New York, 1923.

WIEMAN, HENRY N., "*Methods of Private Religious Living.*" Macmillan, New York, 1929.

CHAPTER IX

MUNRO, HARRY C., "*The Pastor and Religious Education,*" Chapters 8, 10. Abingdon Press, New York, 1930.

RESEARCH SERVICE BULLETIN No. 3-4, "*Personnel and Work of Director of Religious Education,*" Section 2. International Council of Religious Education, 1926.

DATE DUE

BV 1531 .M86 1930

Munro, Harry C.

The director of religious education

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BV1531.M86 1930
Munro, Harry The director of religious
3 0645 0003 2336 6